

1-1-1975

UA68/8/3 The Student Researcher, Vol. I, No. I

Phi Alpha Theta

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu_org



Part of the [History of Science, Technology, and Medicine Commons](#), [Social History Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Phi Alpha Theta, "UA68/8/3 The Student Researcher, Vol. I, No. I" (1975). *Student Organizations*. Paper 13.
http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu_org/13

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Organizations by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact connie.foster@wku.edu.

the Student researcher

WESTERN
KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY

THE STUDENT RESEARCHER
A PHI ALPHA THETA PUBLICATION

Volume I

1975

Number I

Publication of Eta-Pi Chapter
Western Kentucky University

Student Editorial Committee
James R. Harris, Chairman
Jean D. Becker
George R. Bowling
Mary G. O'Sullivan
David F. Smith

Consulting Editors
Dr. J. Crawford Crowe
Dr. John D. Minton
Bill L Weaver
Charles Bussey

PREFACE

While often overshadowed by faculty research, the efforts of students should not be overlooked, and this journal will hopefully encourage scholarly research by students and provide a means by which their efforts will be recognized. Phi Alpha Theta is greatly indebted to the History Department of Western Kentucky University headed by Dr. Richard Troutman. We are grateful to the Senior Editorial Committee consisting of Mr. Charles Bussey, Dr. J. Crawford Crowe, Dr. John Minton, and Mr. Bill Weaver for their assistance in this project. We also thank the Student Editorial Committee consisting of Jean Becker, George R. Bowling, James R. Harris, Mary O'Sullivan, and David Smith. A special thanks goes to Tom Foster who designed the cover of this journal and to Dr. Drew Harrington and Dr. Paul Cook for their contributions. For their tireless and exacting efforts, Phi Alpha Theta wishes to thank the typists under the direction of Mrs. Earlene Chelf--Vickie Bell, Melissa Keffer, and Brenda Shaw. Our most profound debt of gratitude goes to the contributing writers--those who were published and those who were not--that constitute a group which forms the heart of any publication.

Eta-Pi Chapter
Phi Alpna Theta
Western Kentucky University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Kentucky and the Yellow Fever Epidemic of 1878 BY NANCY BAIRD	1
Schopenhauer in History--Sources, Characteristics, Influences BY CHRISTOPHER BELCHER	15
Norwegians in North Dakota: Immigration and Early Settlement BY RONALD DALEY	27
Public Opinion, the Press, and the Dreyfus Affair BY MARY O'SULLIVAN	46
Horse Boots: A Nineteenth Century Kentucky Industry BY NANCY BAIRD	59

KENTUCKY AND THE YELLOW FEVER EPIDEMIC
OF 1878

In this hour of distress and of anguish and woe,
Unbosom your bowels of mercy and go--
Prove a ministering angel, in word and in deed,
Thus gaining the nation's esteem as your meed,
Or else of the plenty of which you are blessed
Send something to aid those so sorely distressed. . . .

B.M.R., Georgetown, Ky.
Louisville Courier-Journal
September 16, 1878

Yellow fever, although generally considered a tropical disease, has plagued the United States from New Orleans to Boston. In 1699 the disease killed one-sixth, and a century later one-tenth, of the inhabitants of Philadelphia, and it periodically swept through other northern cities. By the nineteenth century, however, the disease usually seemed confined to the South, where its frequent visits killed untold thousands. In 1822 Louisville was severely stricken by the "bilious fever," but unlike her sister southern states, Kentucky then remained free from yellow fever for 56 years. In 1878 the disease struck the South with vicious fury. During her noble effort to aid others, the Commonwealth became vulnerable to the disease, which killed more than 220 of her residents and left hundreds of others weakened and emaciated. In fighting the disease within her borders, Kentucky's newly created State Board of Health became convinced that it must have greater authority and cooperation if the state was to be protected from future deadly epidemics.¹

In May of 1878 yellow fever appeared in the West Indies and by mid-summer its deadly shadow had begun to fall across the southern portion of the United States. From the Gulf Coast ports the disease traveled the rivers and rails of the South as the silent companion of fever refugees who fled northward. The cause of the disease was unknown, but leading physicians of the day held many heated discussions concerning its origin, spread, and control. Some believed it was a disease of miasmatic origin and therefore believed that a quarantine was of little value in preventing its spread. Other practitioners were convinced that fomites or germs cause the

Nancy Baird

disease and these pathogens were spread by clothing, baggage, or other items handled by persons in epidemic areas. To prevent the spread of these fomites, many practicing physicians believed strict quarantine essential to protect areas where the disease had not yet appeared.²

As the South's refugees began to escape northward, many cities and towns in the Upper Mississippi Valley established rigid quarantines. Cairo, Paducah, Columbus, St. Louis, and Cincinnati closed their doors to those who sought safety there. These actions were viewed by numerous Louisvillians as needless and cruel, for they concluded that yellow fever was unlikely to exist so far north. Theodore S. Bell, a Louisville physician of high repute and a man of strong convictions, was the major spokesman against the quarantine. Bell stated that the disease was one "that springs from a local surface," but that Louisville, once given to such fevers, had been "improved sufficiently and never produces a case now...." Dr. Luke Pryor Blackburn, a Kentucky native who had won national recognition for his skills and courage in yellow fever control during previous epidemics in the Deep South, argued that the Louisville Board of Health must prohibit the entry of refugees to protect the city. The friendship of the two physicians became strained over their opposing opinions.³

On August 2 the city's Board of Health met and resolved that

... any attempt at quarantine would not only be galling and detrimental to social and commercial interests, but would also be inhuman in the extreme, and that, as the agents and representatives of a Christian community, nothing is left us but to provide proper and ample hospital accommodations for such unfortunate sick as may come to our city.

Dr. Bell became the hero of the day and later was feted by a large gathering at the Old Exposition Building, where he was recognized for his noble service to Louisville and the refugees. Dr. Blackburn's opinion was ignored and the Falls City, a major transportation center, opened its gates to hundreds of refugees who were scattered among the town's hotels, boarding houses, and private homes. The citizens of "fever proof" Crab Orchard, Grayson Springs, and Mammoth Cave offered to care for any southerners who were unable to find accommodations in Louisville, and many other towns across the

state also welcomed their frightened brethren.⁴

Kentuckians were generous, not only in providing a haven for southern refugees, but also for sending aid to those persons who had become victims of the disease. Fraternal, social, and religious organizations formed relief societies and offered their services and financial resources to the citizens of Memphis, Granada, Vicksburg, New Orleans, and other towns devastated by the yellow blight. "Nickel boxes" were placed in stores and business establishments frequented by the public, and sizeable funds were collected. Kentucky's ingenuity was well demonstrated in raising money through lectures, raffles, benefit concerts, fairs, festivals, minstrel shows, moonlight railway excursions, and even mule races. Louisville's mayor and many of the town's business men received donations from philanthropic individuals and groups. Some of these gifts were large; others, like the \$3.33 contribution from the children of a Louisville mission school and the \$62 draft received from a Negro church in Columbus, represented probable sacrifices for their donors, who saw others in greater need. In a three month period, about \$40,000 was accumulated from generous Kentuckians, but unfortunately about half of this amount was to be needed by Kentucky's fever victims.⁵

As the disease crept closer to the southern borders of the Commonwealth, Louisville newspapers carried detailed and distressing news of the epidemic. By late August more than four columns of the Courier-Journal's front page were devoted to the disease; by mid-September only a double column of advertisements vied with the deadly scourge for front page coverage. Articles previously entitled "Yellow Fever News" were headed with the more ominous titles of "Shadow of Death," "Scythe's Sweep," and "Busy Spade," and the general panic and financial devastation wrought by the pestilence were compared to the conditions experienced in the South during the worst months of the Civil War. Louisvillians were informed that the death rate in New Orleans and Vicksburg had reached alarming figures and that "from every stricken town there is a fearful stampede... 2,500 fled from Memphis in a three day period." Urgent requests for physicians, nurses, food and medical supplies were received in Louisville, and Kentuckians answered the pleas with a generous extension of services and resources. Dr. Blackburn, who was campaigning for the nomination of Governor of Kentucky, announced that he would halt his political activities and hold himself ready "to go whenever and wherever called to the aid of my fellow beings or fellow citizens... regardless of the danger incurred or the labor required." A veteran of many previous

epidemics, Blackburn predicted that the epidemic would be fearful in its severity and spread, for the disease had appeared unusually early in the season and could be ended only by a killing frost. Dr. Bell continued to assure the citizens of Louisville that they were safe from the pestilence, for their city was one of the cleanest on earth. As a precaution, however, many residents made an effort to disinfect their property. The Louisville police force was requested to report any filthy streets, gutters, alleys or private property, and the city street department was ordered to double its force, if necessary, to prevent miasmatic conditions from threatening the city. The Courier-Journal carried advertisements for Simmon's Liver Regulator, a yellow fever "preventative," in addition to a letter from Dr. Blackburn in which he told of this treatment for the disease. Other physicians gave verbose interviews concerning their exalted opinions on the improbability of the disease appearing in Louisville. One doctor was quoted as saying that he had no advice for his fellow citizens, for he felt that his colleagues, most of whom had never seen a case of yellow fever, had already "sufficiently bored" the city's populace. The physicians' variety of opinions undoubtedly created mixed emotions among the residents of the Falls City as they greeted the refugees who flocked to them for succor.⁶

For her visitors who might be stricken, Louisville made many provisions. Printed cards were placed on boats and trains that gave the addresses of aid centers in Louisville, and a signal system was devised to inform the town's medical faculty and hospital staff when ill passengers arrived at the depots and wharves. Arrangements were made to transfer sick arrivals to Louisville's Marine Hospital, and the main building of St. John's Eruptive Hospital was prepared for emergency use until larger accommodations were erected on the hospital grounds. Completed within a week, the new one story 34 x 50 foot building was soon filled with transient fever patients, thus prompting the building of another structure nearby. A resident physician and a druggist were employed, and local doctors made frequent visits to the facilities. Acquisition of an adequate nursing staff proved to be difficult, for none of the city's nurses was experienced in caring for yellow fever victims, and many of them were fearful of contracting the disease. Two Episcopalian nuns and several medical students from the University of Louisville provided most of the nursing care. Requests for underwear and bedding from the hospital officials were promptly answered by the citizens, who donated enough to "almost equip an entire regiment." Although the importance of medical records was not generally recognized, the hospital attendants kept relatively detailed records,

noting name, race, residence, date of admission, date of discharge or death, and daily body temperature and pulse rate of the 89 patients treated. The mortality rate was 34 percent.⁷

Louisville's first fever cases were reported in mid-August among refugees, but the disease soon appeared among residents, most of whom lived within a block of a railroad depot. The Courier-Journal, which had originally denied rumors of the fever among residents, confirmed the dreaded suspicions and fears of the citizenry in late September--yellow fever could and did exist in the Falls City. A study of local cases confirmed in the minds of many physicians that the disease was transmissible; others, including Dr. Bell, refused to believe that the sickness was yellow fever. They insisted that the malady was a "malignant remittant fever" caused by filth which contaminated the atmosphere.⁸

Opinions varied concerning the number of indigenous cases in Louisville, but the disease was never epidemic there.⁹ However, a Cincinnati newspaper reported that Louisville was being ravaged by the illness and that her citizens were fleeing in panic. St. Louis and Montgomery immediately placed quarantines against all goods arriving from Louisville, as did several small towns above the Falls. It was with considerable venom, and perhaps a bit of pleasure, that the Courier-Journal carried stinging criticisms of her rival city, and the "malicious lie." Kentuckians were told that Cincinnati, previously known as the Queen City, should be renamed the Quarantine City, for she had closed her gates to the South's refugees; those who had been able to penetrate the "sacred precincts of the selfish and terror stricken city and afterwards [were] taken sick, were at once consigned to the pest house." The Atlanta Constitution was quoted as saying that the error was probably made "with malicious purpose to injure Louisville," and thus profit from her loss of commerce. Whatever the reason or intent behind the error, it temporarily harmed relations between the two towns but provided lively reading in a newspaper that was otherwise filled with horrifying death counts. To counteract the damage inflicted by the incorrect report, the Louisville newspaper published comments from individuals and other papers that commended the Falls City and proclaimed her "the only city of refuge in the United States," and it agreed with the Little Rock Democrat that Louisville's action during the epidemic would be "considered one of the proudest pages of the history of the city."¹⁰

Although only a minute percentage of Louisville's resident population suffered with the malady, the citizens of Bowling Green, Fulton, and Hickman were more severely

stricken. Bowling Green, located at the junction of the Memphis line with the Louisville and Nashville and Great Southern railroads, had made no effort to prevent the entry of persons from ravaged areas, for the local health officers supported the theory that the disease was not transmissible and could not break out at that latitude. The town's authorities tried to provide for the transients they welcomed. Plans were made to set up a hospital where refugees could be treated. A building was rented for this purpose, but area residents violently objected to the plan and the house was never used. The first case of the disease was reported on August 25; the first indigenous case appeared in town on September 9 but was not reported as yellow fever by the attending physician. Throughout September, citizens of Bowling Green strongly denied that any local cases had developed. However, in early October the health officer admitted that the disease prevailed in one area of the town. During October about 48 cases and 26 fatalities were recorded. All of the persons stricken lived within a two block area of the railroad depot. It was noted with some surprise by the local health officer that no cases of the blight appeared in a neighboring area, "Hell's Half Acre," where sanitation and living conditions were abominable, the sewers frequently overflowed, and cholera, typhoid and other "zymotic disorders" had left large death tolls in previous years. While the town sat in fear of the disease and its potential hazard, railroad conductors brought medical and food supplies to the distressed and provided free transportation for those whose pecuniary circumstances prevented them from leaving the stricken town.¹¹

The residents of Fulton had attempted to prevent the scourge by disinfecting the town, but 12 cases and five deaths were reported during early October. Most of the victims lived between the railroad station and a large water-filled sink hole. Panic followed the first reports of the arrival of "yellow jack," and all but 15 of the town's healthy white residents fled. Those who remained resolved to stay and aid their stricken neighbors. Seven Negroes also volunteered to help; the remainder of the black population was ordered to flee. By mid-October the disease appeared to be under control, and the Courier-Journal announced that "everything, except the doctors, is serene...." By the end of the month most of the town's citizens had returned, and business was reported "as brisk as ever."¹²

Of the four Kentucky towns where indigenous cases of the disease developed, Hickman, a river town of about 1,200, was the most severely stricken. Between August 13 and the sixth of November, 462 local residents were attacked and 150

died. The town's authorities had established a quarantine earlier, but it was not enforced, and steamboats from infected areas were allowed to land and discharge freight and passengers. The first local cases were two children who regularly sold apples on the steamboats along the wharf. The number of cases rose during August and on September 1 the disease was declared epidemic. All but an estimated 270 of the town's healthy, Caucasian population fled, leaving their homes and businesses unprotected. The town marshal organized a black police force to prevent vandalism. Nearly all places of business were closed; one exception was a book store, whose owner declared that since he had nothing else to do, he might as well attend to his business. A relief committee, established to aid those who were ill, dispensed the necessities of life so generously donated by the peoples of the state. Louisville's City Council telegraphed the relief committee — "Don't let your people want for anything — call on us and you shall be supplied." They were answered with a request for 25 mattresses, 25 pairs of blankets, 5 gallons of bourbon, 5 gallons of sherry, 1 barrel of hams, 3 barrels of bacon, 1 barrel of sugar and 100 pounds of coffee. The request was filled immediately.¹³

As news from Hickman reached Louisville, every effort was made to help the stricken town. Governor James McCreary issued a proclamation requesting aid, and Dr. Pinckney Thompson, President of the State Board of Health, urged volunteers to go to Hickman. Physicians, nurses, relief men, telegraph operators, ministers, and druggists from Kentucky and neighboring states answered the call, and many gave their lives in this noble endeavor. Despite the number of volunteers, the shortage of doctors was critical. All six of Hickman's physicians were stricken with the disease, and only one survived. Three volunteer physicians also forfeited their lives. Of all the physicians in attendance, only Luke Blackburn had any previous experience in administering to yellow fever patients.¹⁴

Among those who went to Hickman were two "sanitarians," Dr. Thompson and the Assistant State Geologist. They found that "Old Hickman," the lower portion of the town where the majority of cases occurred, contained several areas that abounded in the "effluvia" of animal and vegetable decomposition. Only one family which stayed in this area remained free of the disease. The majority of the residents who lived in the newer section of the town, located on a bluff overlooking the river, had fled; among those who remained, a few cases were reported. Although they believed that poor sanitation might have partially explained the presence of the disease, the sanitarians were not able to draw any real conclusions concerning the cause of yellow fever in Hickman.¹⁵

Two of Kentucky's river towns were successful in preventing the disease from attacking their citizens. As the disease

crept towards them, officials in Columbus and Paducah established and rigidly enforced quarantines. Several quarantine camps were set up near Paducah and persons from infected areas were required to spend 10 fever-free days there before entering the town. No north-bound boats or trains were permitted to stop to discharge passengers or freight, and the town was carefully disinfected. No cases appeared in Paducah. A cordon of volunteer policemen was placed around Columbus, and that town was also disinfected. When nearby Cairo, Fulton, and Hickman reported indigenous yellow fever, sanitation efforts in Columbus were increased, but many residents apparently had little confidence in the measures. One resident was so frightened he mistakenly scattered a barrel of flour on his premises and then hurried off to the country with a barrel of lime packed among his supplies.¹⁶

Following the abatement of the disease after the arrival of cold weather, four official reports were written about the outbreak in the state. Three of these were included in the State Board of Health's first annual report; the fourth was printed by the Louisville Board of Health. Each author interpreted his observations, and all four agreed in principle concerning the future protection of the state against the disease. All concurred that yellow fever was an infectious disease, communicated through the atmosphere rather than by personal contact. Rigid quarantine similar to those used successfully by Columbus and Paducah were essential to safeguard the health of Kentucky's towns. There was, however, some disagreement regarding the role moisture and filth played in aiding the atmospheric conditions needed to spread the disease. The malady had appeared more prevalent in areas characterized by miasmatic-producing conditions, but it also by-passed other filth-ridden districts and appeared in areas known for cleanliness. Despite the difference of opinions, all reports agreed that a clean, well drained town would be an asset to the health of the community. Recommendations were also made that state and local boards of health be strengthened and laws and ordinances be adopted to give the boards full control of sanitary conditions and power to enforce the law, for "cleanliness is next to Godliness, and ... Providence cares for and protects those who care for themselves." One of the reports, made by the president of the State Board, suggested that since flight appeared to be the best safeguard once the disease entered a locality, the Board should be given the power and money to evacuate all threatened residents, even though such action might be viewed as a violation of individual rights.¹⁷

Little mention was made in the four reports concerning the treatment of the disease, for few medications were used. Bed rest, replacement of body liquids, cracked ice and liquids

to allay thirst, sponging the body, especially with alcohol, to reduce the fever, and attention to the general comfort of the patient seemed to be the usual care given. The destruction of all excrements and contaminated clothing and bedding was recommended as a necessary preventative in yellow fever control. Only one other preventative was mentioned, perhaps with tongue-in-cheek, as having any possible merit. One report noted that several conductors on the Mississippi Central railroad had been advised by a New Orleans physician to steep their undergarments in a strong brine or salt solution and wear the treated clothing whenever traveling in infected areas. They remained free of the disease, although they developed annoying exzema in areas where the salty garments remained in prolonged contact with moist portions of the body.¹⁸

From Kentucky's 1878 visit from the yellow blight came a deeper awareness of the obligations of the state and local governments and their agencies to the welfare of the people. The State Board of Health, created by the legislature in March of that year, had met only once since its formation. When the disease appeared to threaten the state, the members of the Board convened in Louisville to discuss what action they should take. Its president had written earlier to the mayors of several cities urging the passage of "ordinances which would confer on local boards full power to enforce all sanitary reforms." A discussion on the possibilities of sending nurses and supplies to Hickman ended when the members realized they did not have the power to disburse money for such a project. The small appropriation they received from the state was ear-marked for travel expenses of the Board members and for the salary of the Board's secretary, their only paid member. Four physicians, including Dr. Blackburn, volunteered to go to Hickman under the auspices of the Board and to do whatever was necessary. The four refused to accept any compensation for their services; travel money for the nurses who accompanied them to Hickman came from the personal funds of the Board's president, who had little hope of ever being reimbursed.¹⁹

The State Board also had to contend with lukewarm attitudes of "many of those of our brethren from whom we had hoped for aid...." There appears to have been some animosity between the State Board and local boards, which perhaps resented infringement on their local authority. Louisville's Board refused to honor the request of the State Board of Health to submit a report on the outbreak there.²⁰

During the next two decades Kentucky was not threatened by yellow fever. However, in that interval, the State Board of Health grew from a powerless agency to one that had the

power and authority to act during an emergency. In 1897 yellow fever again began its deadly journey up the Mississippi Valley. This time the State Board of Health acted with speed. All boats and trains entering Kentucky from infected areas were inspected by members or agents of the Board. The ill were isolated, all baggage was disinfected with formaldehyde gas, and the destination of all passengers was recorded and local authorities were notified of their impending arrival. Although quarantines were not instituted, no cases of the disease were reported among the Commonwealth's residents, although a few cases developed among the visitors.²¹

During the 1898 epidemic in Cuba, Dr. Walter Reed proved that the mosquito aedes aegyptae was the intermediate host or vector for the parasite of yellow fever, and that destruction of the mosquito's breeding grounds could eliminate the disease. In 1904 two members of the Kentucky State Board of Health attended the session of the American Public Health Association meeting held in Havana. They observed the successful control initiated there, and on their return to the Commonwealth, they took measures to prevent future epidemics. Among other precautions, circulars were distributed to educate local officials and private citizens on yellow fever control.²²

Despite Reed's discovery, many areas of the South were slow to clean their gutters and drain or treat ponds and swampy areas. In the summer of 1905 when the disease appeared in New Orleans, the Kentucky State Board of Health ordered Kentuckians to "drain, empty or properly oil and cover all ponds, barrels and other receptacles which are or may become breeding places for mosquitos" and to screen all houses, "not only against mosquitos which convey yellow fever, but against flies, which carry typhoid fever."

It is believed that the fear of yellow fever will prove a blessing to Kentucky, if it induces such health reforms as will not only prevent it, but lessen typhoid fever, diptheria and other domestic pestilences which cause such large and needless sick and death rates every year."

As before, trains and boats carrying passengers from fever areas were inspected and local health authorities were notified of the refugees' forthcoming arrival. The state's residents were encouraged to "make war on all unsanitary conditions" rather than establish quarantines against their less fortunate neighbors.²³

Quick action by and cooperation between the state and local boards of health in 1897 and 1905 made it possible for the Commonwealth to care for thousands of the South's fever refugees without endangering the health and lives of Kentucky's citizens or restricting commerce between the state and the Deep South. The fever never again threatened the state, but the knowledge gained by health authorities during the epidemics between 1878 and 1905 proved invaluable in their quest to increase health standards for all Kentuckians. The generosity and love that the Commonwealth's citizens exhibited during those epidemics won the admiration and gratitude of the South. Kentuckians, like the traveler from Samaria, refused to "pass by on the other side."

NOTES

1. For an interesting, although horrifying, study of the 1793 epidemic in Philadelphia, see J.H. Powell, Bring Out Your Dead (Philadelphia, 1949). The 1822 epidemic in Louisville is mentioned in most early histories of the state. There apparently was some difference of opinion as to the type of fever, and therefore it was called "bilious fever." However, the symptoms would indicate that it was yellow fever. During the 56 years when the disease seemed to avoid Kentucky, the state's resorts became popular summer retreats for the families of wealthy southern planters who wished to escape the ever present dangers of their fever-ridden areas. See J. Winston Coleman, Springs of Kentucky (Lexington, 1955). The 1878 epidemic was the most extended yellow fever epidemic in the history of the United States. It invaded 132 towns and caused deaths in 15,934 of the more than 74,000 cases. New Orleans reported 4,500 deaths, Vicksburg lost 1,000 residents and Memphis recorded 5,100 deaths and the city was left bankrupt. The disease struck four towns in Kentucky but was epidemic only in Hickman, where the percentage of cases and deaths was as high as the above mentioned towns.

2. Miasma was believed to be a poisonous gas formed by decaying vegetation and filth. For a good explanation of nineteenth century views on the causes of disease, see Charles Rosenberg, "Causes of Cholera: Aspects of the Etiological Thought in Nineteenth Century America," Bulletin of the History of Medicine, XXXIV (1960), 311-354.

3. Louisville Courier-Journal, Aug. 21, 22, 1878. The quotation is from the Louisville Medical News, August 1878.

4. Louisville Courier-Journal, Aug. 18, 19, Sept. 22, 1878; J.N. McCormack, Medical Pioneers of Kentucky (Bowling Green, 1917), 168. The quotation can be found in the Official Report of Dr. E.O. Brown, Physician in Charge of the Yellow Fever Hospital at Louisville, Kentucky (Louisville, 1879), 3.

5. Mention of these and other donations and fund raising projects can be found in nearly every issue of the Courier-Journal between mid-August and late October of 1878.

6. Louisville Courier-Journal, Aug. 20, 23, 25, 28, 31, Sept. 1, 4, 10, 29, 1878.

7. Ibid., Sept. 14, 15, 18, 1878; Official Record of Dr. Brown, 4-5.

8. Official Record of Dr. Brown, 5; Louisville Medical News, September, 1878; Louisville Courier-Journal, Sept. 29, 1878; Pinckney Thompson, "Yellow Fever in Kentucky," First Annual Report of the State Board of Health of Kentucky (Frankfort, 1879), LX. The pages of the early Reports of the State Board of Health are numbered in capital Roman numerals.

9. Dr. Brown's report stated there were 50 indigenous cases and 28 deaths; the State Board of Health reported 34 cases and 4 deaths.

10. Louisville Courier-Journal, Sept. 16, 26, 30, Oct. 3, 7, 9, 1878. The quotations are from the Sept. 30, Oct. 3 and Oct. 9 issues respectively.

11. R.C. Thomas, "Yellow Fever in Bowling Green," First Annual Report of the State Board of Health of Kentucky, XXXVII-XLII.

12. Louisville Courier-Journal, Sept. 6, 24, 27, Oct. 10, 25, 1878. The quotations are from the Oct. 10 and 15 issues.

13. Ibid., Sept. 1, 28, 1878; Thompson, "Yellow Fever in Kentucky," XLVIII,L; John R. Procter, "Notes on the Yellow Fever Epidemic at Hickman, Kentucky, 1878; ibid., LXXIX-XCI. The quotation is from "Yellow Fever in Kentucky," Bulletin of the Kentucky State Department of Health, 43 (Oct.-Dec., 1970), 10.

14. Thompson, "Yellow Fever in Kentucky," XLVII-XLVIII, LXVII, LXIX. Following the abatement of the disease, Dr. Blackburn received numerous awards and declarations of praise. The people of Paducah and Hickman held a formal reception for the physician and presented him with a gold medal as a token of their appreciation for "his heroic devotion to the people of Hickman, Kentucky and other southern cities...." A similar gold medal was given to him as a "Testimonial of Love and Gratitude from Southern Refugees," and the grateful father of one of his patients gave him a gold watch charm. These and other tokens of appreciation for similar devotion during earlier epidemics are now the property of the Kentucky Historical Society. Blackburn was also the subject of official proclamations made by the McDowell Medical Society of Hopkinsville and the state legislature in which he was praised for his fearless devotion to yellow fever victims at Louisville and

Hickman. The Courier-Journal of September 22, 1878 carried a letter from Dr. Bell in which he praised Blackburn, but other letters printed in the paper during September and October noted that although Blackburn's activities were noteworthy, other physicians volunteered their services also, and several of them made the supreme sacrifice. In May of 1879 the "Hero of Hickman" was nominated as the Democratic candidate for governor of Kentucky and was later elected by a 55% majority of the popular vote. One of his earliest recommendations to the legislature was to suggest the erection of a monument in the memory of those who died while aiding the fever victims at Hickman. For a relatively complete discussion of the heroes of the 1878 epidemic in Kentucky and Tennessee, see J.P. Dromgoole, Heroes, Honors and Horrors, Yellow Fever 1878 (Louisville, 1879), and J.M. Keating, History of the Yellow Fever Epidemic 1878 (Frankfort, 1879).

15. Thompson, "Yellow Fever in Kentucky," LII-LIX.

16. Louisville Courier-Journal, Aug. 22, Sept. 25, 27, Oct. 1, 3, 4, 1878. In 1873 Paducah was severely stricken by a cholera epidemic; the disease was believed to have been introduced into the town by steamboat passengers. This might explain Paducah's imposition of a strict quarantine during the yellow fever epidemic of 1878.

17. Thompson, "Yellow Fever in Kentucky," LXII-LXIII; Procter, "Notes on Yellow Fever," XCII-XCIII, XCIX-C; Thomas, "Yellow Fever in Bowling Green," XL-XLIII. The quotation is from the Official Report of Dr. Brown, 9.

18. Thomas, "Yellow Fever in Bowling Green" XLIV-XLV; Official Report of Dr. Brown, 7-8.

19. First Annual Report of the State Board of Health, VII-LX.

20. Ibid., VI.

21. Biennial Report of the State Board of Health of Kentucky, 1898-1899 (Frankfort, 1899), 40-41.

22. Biennial Report of the State Board of Health of Kentucky, 1904-1905 (Frankfort, 1905), 170-171.

23. Ibid., 173-174.

SCHOPENHAUER IN HISTORY--
SOURCES, CHARACTERISTICS, INFLUENCES

"Your eternal quibbles, your laments over the stupid world and human misery, give me bad nights and unpleasant dreams."¹ Saying this, Arthur Schopenhauer's mother refused to grant her teenage son permission to lodge with her at Weimar. Even Schopenhauer's mother found his brooding ways and insolent manners too offensive to be balanced by his brilliance. This anecdote serves as a proper introduction to the life and writings of one great nineteenth century philosopher. His numerous talents in language, science, and philosophy often were ignored because of his professions and practices of pessimism, misogyny, and atheism. [Schopenhauer's reputation, however, took the soaring flight after his death, and his influence was felt eventually in every sphere.] Nor has a peak yet been reached. Especially because of his prophetic appreciation of Easternⁿ thought and his pivotal position at the juncture of the two dominant modes of philosophizing today, Schopenhauer's popularity continues to rise.

This paper focuses on three aspects of the Schopenhauer complex. The first includes the five components of his background: (a) philosophical, (b) historical, (c) psychological, (d) philosophic, and (e) literary. The second is Schopenhauer's personal philosophy, manifested in his life as well as in his writings. Schopenhauer's philosophy is divided into two parts, content and form, and the important characteristics in each of these areas are discussed. The final aspect of the Schopenhauer complex is of paramount importance historically, for it describes his influence on intellectuals and artists as well as on his lay audience. This facet contains a somewhat arbitrary division of Schopenhauer's influence into five types: (a) philosophical, (b) historical, (c) psychological, (d) artistic, and (e) popular.

Kant and Plato are Schopenhauer's most obvious philosophical sources as he himself indicates. From Plato he seems to have acquired his lofty conception of philosophy and a belief in the unchanging nature of truth. Kant provided him the form of metaphysics from which he began the investigations which found final formulation in Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung. A third influence which played a role in giving Schopenhauer's philosophy, particularly his informal philosophy, its particular bias was the early nineteenth

century business world. According to two of Schopenhauer's biographers, Patrick Gardiner and Helen Zimmern, his father believed firmly in the school of experience and so committed his son at an early age to the care of a business friend in France.² Schopenhauer was pleased with this method of training; for in "On Education" he advocated it as superior to beginning with abstract studies.

There came a time, however, when Schopenhauer wished that he were more familiar with the theoretical aspects of education. He began by studying the Classics and, seemingly invigorated by his long abstinence from formal education, succeeded admirably.³ This Classical initiation infected him with an enthusiasm for structure and reason which he never lost; this is what is ignored by those who label Schopenhauer a romantic or an irrationalist.⁴ Literary forces other than the Classics were evidently limited to a few novels. In "On Education", Schopenhauer lists these as the Spanish Picaresco novels such as Gil Blas, several novels by Sir Walter Scott, and The Vicar of Wakefield. Other novels, especially the Romantic ones, he considered dangerous because they represented the world as happy and just.

Following his initiation into the world of scholarship through the door of the Classics but before his study of Kant and Plato at Gottingen, Schopenhauer lodged at Weimar apart from his mother, who had formed a salon where great literary figures of the day could be found.⁵ Goethe and Schopenhauer met here and were mutually impressed. After they became better acquainted, Goethe is reported to have defended Schopenhauer against the mockery of some young girls by chiding them, "Leave that youth in peace; in due time he will grow over all our heads."⁶ Most intellectual historians would agree that the time at which Schopenhauer would surpass Goethe has not yet come to pass and is not likely to do so. [Some would stretch the hyperbole to the other side, however, claiming that in fact Schopenhauer's profession as a metaphysical writer was forced by Goethe's presence in the other literary areas which interested Schopenhauer.] R. J. Hollingdale, in an introduction to Essays and Aphorisms by Schopenhauer, advocates this view by arguing that the nineteenth century German tendency towards metaphysical speculation was the result of the historical presence of Goethe, who conquered poetry, drama, and the novel and left nothing except metaphysics for his followers to pursue.⁷ The argument may contain some truth, especially where there was an acquaintance with Goethe, as with Schopenhauer, but to explain Hegel, Schelling, Feuerbach, Marx, and Nietzsche as no more than "sublimating poets" who sublimated their poetic drive to social or political theorizing appears invalid.

Having discussed possible philosophical, literary, and historical influences on Schopenhauer, the psychological

and the "historical-philosophical" influences remain to be considered. It is best that the intricate questions of the former be postponed briefly in order that the influence classified as "historical-philosophical" be disposed of.

Certain negative influences on Schopenhauer's development as a philosopher that are neither purely philosophical nor purely historical. [These influences would not have exerted intense pressure on him if they had been farther removed, yet in any case they probably would have caused him to react in the same general direction as he did.] The reference here is to the great post-Kantians at Berlin--Hegel, Scheiermacher, and Fichte. Much of what Schopenhauer says is obviously directed towards refuting these men who received the applause which he considered his. Soon after his arrival at Berlin he began putting sarcastic comments or potent refutations in the margins of his notes from the lectures of Fichte and Scheiermacher.⁸ From the beginning he disagreed with their position that philosophy was subservient to theology. Later he was to emphasize the necessity of separating the study of philosophy from that of theology at every opportunity in his writings. Of Hegel Schopenhauer bitterly complained,

It is impossible that an age that for twenty years has applauded a Hegel, that intellectual Caliban, as the greatest of all philosophers, so loudly that it echoes through the whole of Europe, would make him who has looked on that desirous of its approbation.⁹

Schopenhauer's bitterness towards academic philosophy has its roots in his unfortunate experiences as a student and teacher at Berlin.

However much he was influenced by his education, friends, and enemies, Schopenhauer probably had his future determined for him with his inheritance of certain psychological traits and the early development of others. His family was of Dutch ancestry, but they had lived for several generations in Danzig. Helen Zimmern relates that Schopenhauer's great-grandfather's house was chosen to host Peter the Great and his wife when they came to the province. A near catastrophe ensued when the royal couple chose a room without a stove or fireplace, until Herr Schopenhauer hit upon the solution of pouring huge quantities of brandy on the floor and lighting it. This act pleased Peter, for he expressed great satisfaction with his host.¹⁰ Schopenhauer inherited his ancestor's practical sense and resourcefulness, but he also inherited the male-linked tendency to brooding and insanity which finally drove his father to

suicide. This tendency to melancholia remained Schopenhauer's most obvious psychological abnormality. It was compounded by a hypersensitivity to disturbances of all types, especially noises. As he states in his essay "On Noise":

The super-abundant display of vitality which takes the form of knocking, hammering, and tumbling things about, has proved a daily torment to me all my life long... Distinguished minds have always shown such an extreme dislike to disturbance of any form...

With or without external disturbance, Schopenhauer worried: "If I have nothing that alarms me I grow alarmed at this very condition, as if there must be something of which I am only ignorant for a time."¹¹ R. J. Hollingdale, a translator and editor of Schopenhauer, holds his dominant psychological drive to be "obstinacy" rather pessimism. Observing that Schopenhauer always took a walk at the same time each day, regardless of the weather or his health, that he did not change his philosophy in the more than forty years after writing his largest work, and that he always ate at the same restaurants, Hollingdale concludes that Schopenhauer's refusal to "abandon or modify an attitude of mind once adopted" led him to life-long pessimism since he had found the role appealing as a youth.¹² Such an interpretation is plausible (if untestable), but the point is that a psychological analysis of Schopenhauer's personality indicates that those parts of his philosophy which are the most "eldritch" can often be traced back to oddities in his pre-philosophical behavior.

Before one can understand either the sources for certain actions or thoughts (what caused them in the Aristotelian sense of causality) or the influences which these actions or thoughts have had on others, one must be clear about the precise nature of these. There is no attempt here, as already noted, to analyze and criticize Schopenhauer's works from a philosophical perspective. The interest is rather in the general ideas which Schopenhauer defended and represented and in the method by which he expounded them. Under the first category one finds the following: (1) pessimism, (2) misogyny, (3) atheism, (4) voluntarism, (5) emphasis on Eastern truth, and (6) the conception of philosophy as man's noblest endeavor. [Under the aegis of style one may compose an adjectival list characterizing Schopenhauer's writings: (1) simple, (2) amusing, (3) aphoristic, and (4) non-systematic.]

Pessimism, misogyny, and atheism are popular doctrines in the history of the West (although one might suspect that their popularity in practice exceeds the theoretical).

Schopenhauer defends all three and is probably unrivaled as an exponent of each. Only Strindberg and Nietzsche approach his defense of misogyny, only Nietzsche nears his stance on atheism, and no one surpasses his view of pessimism. One might like to defend him against being and trying to convert others to being misogynistic, pessimistic, and atheist, but one cannot find facts to support the defense. Scholars have sought to minimize the extent of Schopenhauer's indulgence in these three evils, but he invalidated such attempts by being explicit in his writings and actions. Hazel Barnes, typical of those who would change him, makes bold statements to the effect that she "suspects" that Schopenhauer was "phenomenally an optimist" although "transcendentally a pessimist."¹³

Patrick Gardiner, probably the greatest living Schopenhauer scholar, holds that Schopenhauer's notoriety comes from his view of the omnipotence of the will, which contains the "most distinctive elements in his contribution to philosophy and to speculation in general."¹⁴ Briefly, Schopenhauer's conception of the will as another way of knowing was opposed to Kant's holding that only what can be known through the categories--the Vorstellung--is real and knowable. In The World As Will and Representation Schopenhauer held that not individuals, but all things could be known through the Wille, which means there are two ways of knowing because there are two ways of existing.¹⁵

Another characteristic of Schopenhauer's thought is its closeness to the Eastern religious philosophies, which did not influence his theories in their embryonic stage. Rather he discovered, or was introduced to, the latter, only after he had worked out his system. Lucian Stryk calls Schopenhauer a "natural Buddhist," and refers to the following statement by Schopenhauer to substantiate this epithet:

In any case it must be a satisfaction to me to find my teaching in such close agreement with a religion professed by the majority of men. This agreement must be all the more satisfactory because in my philosophizing I have certainly not been under its influence.¹⁶

This similitude does not make Schopenhauer a great philosopher, any more than possessing the characteristics of being pessimistic, atheistic, and misogynistic. These distinctions would have been forgotten long ago had not Schopenhauer acquired, probably from his study of Plato, a conception of Philosophy as the highest form of knowledge:

Philosophy is an alpine road, and the precipitous path which leads to it is strewn with stone and thorns. The higher you climb, the lonelier, the more desolate grows the way...¹⁷

This is in the philosophia perennis tradition, a dedication to truth for its own sake, foresaking all else, no matter what the cost. Included in the tradition is a ruthless honesty, which many find appealing in Schopenhauer, as Will Durant puts it in his edition of The Works of Schopenhauer, "What we like in Schopenhauer is his honesty."¹⁸

Even the most sincere dedication to a philosophic ideal cannot guarantee success, however. What Schopenhauer had in addition was an engaging style. He opposed his simple expression to the cant of Hegel, which he claimed won support by the lack of paraphraseability. As Hollingdale says, "No German philosopher but Nietzsche employs less jargon."¹⁹ Other stylistic habits of Schopenhauer included a refusal to work within or towards a rigorous system and a tendency to express himself in aphorism. Another endearing characteristic of Schopenhauer was his appreciation of humor, discernible in his life as well as in his writings. Helen Zimmern tells the story of the orangutan that came to Frankfurt. It seems that the aged Schopenhauer was delighted with the creature, visiting it daily and asking his friends to do the same. He heralded it as "the probable ancestor of our race" and "thought the longing of the Will after cognition was personified in this strange and melancholy beast, and compared his mien to that of the Prophet gazing over into the promised land."²⁰

A discussion of Schopenhauer's style serves as transition to a discussion of his influence, for, although not normally acknowledged, some of his most enduring effects on his followers were in the realm of style. From Schopenhauer, Nietzsche inherited the humorous, aphoristic, and non-systematic mode of expression for which he is admired. This becomes apparent when one compares their phrasing on topics such as women, the goal of the philosopher, and the foolishness of the masses and past authorities.

Schopenhauer's influence on philosophers reaches beyond the bitter preacher of the Übermensch. Further research may settle upon Schopenhauer as the missing link between the radically diverse ways of doing philosophy in the twentieth century. It is generally recognized that Schopenhauer's influence on Nietzsche revealed him to be an anticipator of existentialism, or perhaps "one of its direct ancestors... [since] like Nietzsche and like Sartre, Schopenhauer sees many engaged in a struggle to which neither God nor any other Higher Purpose gives redeeming meaning."²¹ What is not acknowledged is Ludwig Wittgenstein's debt to Schopenhauer. Though Wittgenstein used Schopenhauer's philosophy in an original way, Schopenhauer must receive credit for the germ of the idea of the relation of categories of thought to reality, which places him at fountainhead of the

mainstream of twentieth century linguistic philosophy.²² The vitality of Schopenhauer's philosophy cannot be questioned, given its influence on existentialism and linguistic philosophy, but there is more--its impact on the process philosophers Henri Bergson and Alfred North Whitehead. By attributing a will to everything, Schopenhauer provided the service of making reality organic, which is the starting point of the metaphysics of both Bergson and Whitehead.²³

Through his similarity to Eastern thought Schopenhauer further influenced the development of philosophy. Friedrich Maier (1772-1818), who taught Goethe, Schiller, Schlegel, and other German men of letters, introduced Schopenhauer to Eastern philosophy and religion.²⁴ He continued his reading, saying at times only the comfort of the Eastern religions, particularly Buddhism, gave him strength to survive. Schopenhauer was not the first European to be interested in the East nor was he an expert, but his propaganda was among the most cogent of the nineteenth century.

For the first time, professors of philosophy admit...that there has been an indefensible provincial arrogance in the censures of scholars who made the 'History of Philosophy' identical with the 'History of Western Philosophy.'²⁵

Schopenhauer has been important even in such disciplines as history and psychology. Erich Heller, translator and interpreter of Nietzsche, discusses Jacob Burckhardt's dependence on the philosophy of Schopenhauer by quoting from Reflections on World History:

The rivalry between history and poetry has been finally settled by Schopenhauer. Poetry achieves more for our knowledge of the truth about mankind...²⁶

Burckhardt's borrowing from Schopenhauer is more extensive than this indicates. In letters to Nietzsche, Burckhardt refers to Schopenhauer as "our philosopher." He built his conception of the historical method upon Schopenhauer's idea of philosophy as distinct from history because of philosophy's status as a search for the unchanging. According to Schopenhauer, the Hegelian school is wrong:

Those philosophers and glorifiers of history are therefore realistic simpletons, optimists, and eudaemonists, which is to say, mediocre fellows and obstinate philistines... For someone bringing philosophical intentions to history, the study of Herodotus is sufficient...²⁷

Although Schopenhauer denied that psychology can exist and maintained that "there is no Psych," he seems to have influenced Freud.²⁸ Freud pointed out the similarity of Schopenhauer's will to his idea of the unconscious. Scholars have seen parallels, if not actual influence, in their views on women, sex, and religion. Philip Rieff discusses these in Freud--The Mind of the Moralist. The agreement on women is clearly not a case of influence, but it introduces "a fact the significance of which has not yet been properly assessed. . . /that/ the great critical figures in modern philosophy, literature, psychology--Nietzsche, Lawrence, Freud--were misogynists."²⁹ On sex in particular, as an incident of pleasure, Freud and Schopenhauer agree that the pressure is a negative one, towards a release in lieu of which pain is experienced.³⁰ If there was indebtedness of Freud to Schopenhauer, however, it was in religion where both assumed that it is absurd for a rational man to believe. Freud's The Future of an Illusion is very close in structure to Schopenhauer's Dialogues on Religion.³¹

If influence is difficult to establish in the social sciences it is almost impossible in art, since critics muddle the issue with structure and theme comparisons. Thus one might say that Poe studied Schopenhauer and inherited the horror of being buried alive from the German, but such connection is unlikely.³² A more probable influence is that on Kafka and Hardy which Hazel Barnes thinks she has proven. Schopenhauer compared life on earth to a penal colony; a simile which influences Kafka enough for him to base the story, "The Penal Colony" on it.³³ Barnes claims that Hardy, whom she calls second to Nietzsche as Schopenhauer's disciple, was more impressed. Schopenhauer's influence extended itself in music, since it was said in the late nineteenth century that most contemporary musicians, especially those of the Wagnerian school, greatly admired Schopenhauer.³⁴ Ironically, Schopenhauer said that Wagner did not know what music was. In art Schopenhauer's theory of aesthetics appealed to such Symbolists of 1889 as Jean Moreas, Gustave Kahn, and Albert Aurier.³⁵ Usually those fortunate enough to be numbered among the intellectual and artistic elite fail to influence the common man of their world. How did Schopenhauer affect the masses? At first, as usual with new thinkers, they mocked him or, worse, ignored him. Before his death, with the publication of Parega and Paralipomena, the tide began to turn. Disciples began to listen, and then came to look at the senescent philosopher "as if he were a stuffed bear."³⁶ Schopenhauer claimed to hate publicity, yet when his name appeared in the German papers he insisted that ever occurrence be shown him immediately, and he died satisfied that he was receiving finally the notice which should have been his forty years earlier.

It was in England, not Germany, where Schopenhauer's stock began to rise. An article in the Westminster Review

started the trend.³⁷ After his death his popularity increased, so that in 1876 a British writer could refer to him as "one of the most original and picturesque intellectual figures of our time, saying of him that "he has made speculative philosophy acceptable to the man of culture and accessible to the masses."³⁸ He became a man of the people, a cult hero, an eccentric for the British T. Bailey Saunders (1860-1928) translated parts of Parega and Paralipomena and his translations were highly praised:

The latest volume of the Schopenhauer work appears to maintain the standard reached by earlier volumes. Schopenhauer on his lighter side, not as a philosopher, but as a man of the world and moralist, is rapidly becoming popular with English readers, in consequence of the care in which M. Saunders administers small doses of Parega and Paralipomena in the guise of most readable essays. Always pregnant and thought provoking, they are tonic--even when they irritate most.³⁹

Since Schopenhauer was not around to offend his readers, his fame grew quickly until interrupted by the German aggression of this century being attributed him through Nietzsche. The connective to this misguided judgement exists in a remark by Helen Zimmern before the Nazi era in which she censures Schopenhauer for not being as patriotic as the hyper-chauvinist Fichte.⁴⁰

For those who are not attracted to misogyny, atheism, or pessimism Schopenhauer's philosophy must be studied sincerely before a positive impression is made; yet the fact remains that such impression can be made. The nineteenth-century historian of philosophy Francis Bowen, who apologized for including a discussion of Schopenhauer in his survey, said that to give a hearing to his views,

Even for purposes of censure and refutation, seemed too much like promoting the dissemination of evil. For not only is much of his philosophy unsound and pernicious in tendency, but the writer himself is eminently a bad man.

Still Bowen is forced to conclude, after more disparaging remarks, that,

I am almost ashamed to say that I have read his books not only with more interest and enthusiasm, but in many parts with more instruction and delight, than those of any other metaphysician of the century.⁴¹

FOOTNOTES

¹Helen Zimmern, Arthur Schopenhauer--His Life and Philosophy (London, 1876), 32.

²Patrick Gardiner, Schopenhauer (Baltimore, 1963), 8-10; Zimmern, Arthur Schopenhauer, 6-15.

³Zimmern, Schopenhauer, 12.

⁴W. T. Jones, A History of Western Philosophy (4 vols., N. Y., 1969), IV, 158, speaks of "he and all the other Romantics" at the conclusion of his unsympathetic account of Schopenhauer's views on metaphysics, ethics, and aesthetics. Those who commit this "hasty categorization" fallacy against Schopenhauer seem to be in possession of an a priori (i.e. prior to the experience of consulting his works) decision that he must be placed here.

An even more odious confusion causes Schopenhauer to be labelled "irrationalist." He is an "anti-Rationalist," where the "Rationalist" is a philosopher who attempts to deduce the truth about the world without experiencing it, but he is by no means "irrational," (i.e. unreasonable in his method.)

⁵Gardiner, Schopenhauer, 13.

⁶Zimmern, Schopenhauer, 59.

⁷R. J. Hollingdale, editor, Essays and Aphorisms (Baltimore, 1970).

⁸Gardiner, Schopenhauer, 13.

⁹Will Durant, The Works of Schopenhauer (N.Y., 1931), xvi.

¹⁰Zimmern, Schopenhauer, 4-5.

¹¹Ibid., 89.

¹²Hollingdale, Essays, 25-26.

¹³Hazel Barnes, ed., The Pessimist's Handbook (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1964), xxx.

¹⁴Gardiner, Schopenhauer, 124.

¹⁵Ibid., 50-56.

¹⁶Lucien Styrk, World of the Buddha (Garden City, N. Y., 1969), xxxii.

- 17 Zimmern, Schopenhauer, 37.
- 18 Durant, Works, ix.
- 19 Hollingdale, Essays, 35.
- 20 Zimmern, Schopenhauer, 243.
- 21 Barnes, Handbook, ix.
- 22 David Pears, Ludwig Wittenstein (New York, 1970),
11, 40, 76.
- 23 The main argument of this paragraph is my own,
although the individual debts of all the figures mentioned
except Whitehead are recognized by different scholars.
- 24 G.R. Welbon, The Buddhist Nirvana and its Western
Interpreters (Chicago and London, 1968), 155-171.
- 25 Barnes, Handbook, x.
- 26 Erich Heller, The Disinherited Mind (Philadelphia,
1952), 59.
- 27 Ibid., 60.
- 28 Zimmern, Schopenhauer, 37.
- 29 Phillip Reiff, Freud--The Mind of the Moralists
(Carson City, N.W., 1969), 200.
- 30 Ibid., 171.
- 31 Ibid., 323-24.
- 32 Zimmern, Schopenhauer, 247.
- 33 Barnes, Handbook, xv-xix.
- 34 Zimmern, Schopenhauer, 3.
- 35 Ibid., 212.
- 36 Ibid., 240.
- 37 Ibid., 239.
- 38 Ibid., vi-ix.
- 39 T. Bailey Saunders, On Human Nature in "The Philosophy
at Home Series" (London and N.Y., 1902), Review of foreleaf.

40
Zimmern, Schopenhayer, 46-47.

41
Barnes, Handbook, xxix.

NORWEGIANS IN NORTH DAKOTA
IMMIGRATION AND EARLY SETTLEMENT

We've reached the land of desert sweet,
Where nothing grows for man to eat.

Oh! Dakota land, sweet Dakota land,
As on they fiery soil I stand,
I look across the plains,
And wonder why it never rains
Till Gabriel Blows his trumpet sounds
And says the rain's just gone around.

The Norwegian settlement in North Dakota began essentially as a product of interstate migration. A writer in the Valley City Times stated: "But little foreign emigration has reached North Dakota directly from the old country; nearly all have become Americanized through a former settlement in old states."¹ Many Norwegian immigrants stopped in older settlements in Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota, worked as laborers and tenants there for a time, and then moved westward to acquire free or inexpensive land.² Substantial direct migration from Norway to North Dakota did not commence until the late 1880's and early 1890's.

The first Norwegian immigrants to America arrived in the 1820's and settled in western New York State. The 1830's marked the early settlement of Norwegians in Illinois and Wisconsin; the 1840's in Iowa; the 1850's and 1860's in Minnesota; and the 1870's in the Dakotas.³ The settlements of Norwegians in Dakota in the 1870's served as the culmination of Norwegian migration in America. Many persons migrated from the widely scattered Norwegian settlements to the Dakota Territory. Norwegian migration in this period came primarily from the "settlements at St. Ansgar (Iowa), Coon Prairie (Wisconsin), and especially, from those in Fillmore and Goodhill counties in southern Minnesota."⁴

The attraction of available free land in the Dakota Territory enticed many Norwegians, young and old, to leave their earlier settlements. The majority of the migrators desired homestead lands, although many did purchase land held by railroads. A contemporary, who lived on the old Pembina Trail near Crookstone, Minnesota, stated that the caravans of prairie schooners which passed daily in the summer of 1882, ". . . were on their way to Larrimore, Devil's Lake, Church's Ferry, or some other point far distant from

a railroad in Dakota."⁵

Many left their old homesteads because of previous failure and hoped for better luck. One wagon on its way to the Dakota Territory had painted on its side the inscription:

Goodbye, Kansas
We bid you adieu
We may immigrate to hell,
But never back to you.⁶

Some may have felt the magical lure of the Dakota frontier when they heard the attractive characteristics ascribed to the land by promoters. A Norwegian journalist, Paul Hjelm Hansen, enhanced the desirability of Dakota when he praised the Red River Valley and prophesied that it would become "one of America's most productive and beautiful regions."⁷ These words, coming from the pen of a fellow Norwegian, no doubt encouraged many to migrate to eastern Dakota. One Norwegian group, probably lured by Hansen's description, attempted to homestead in eastern Dakota Territory only to discover to its chagrin that it had actually settled in Minnesota. Learning of their mistake, they promptly pulled up stakes and moved to the Dakota Territory.⁸

In the late 1880's, especially after North Dakota achieved statehood in 1889, direct immigration from Norway increased. The reasons they left Norway were essentially the same as those of the early Norwegian immigrants who came to America. Many of the Norwegians, particularly the rural people, were irritated by the power and prestige of the upper class. They were frustrated by the rigid formalism of the established church and the alleged "...aloofness of the clergy."⁹

Many of the "American letters" which arrived in Norway referred to social equality in America, where "an ordinary man does not need to take his hat off for either minister or judge."¹⁰ Letters from friends and relatives cannot be over-emphasized in their influence of inducing many to come to America. Many immigrated when they heard of the success of their friends and relatives. Immigrants in Griggs County, when interviewed, stated that they came to America because of high taxes in Norway and because they had relatives in America. The strongest motivating factor, however, was the expectation of quick fortunes.¹¹ The difficulty of making a living in Norway and the impossibility of the poorer class ever acquiring increased wealth, or even of becoming financially secure, compelled many to leave Norway. Many immigrants who came to America intended to return to Norway in five or six years when they had made a small fortune, which would enable them to live more securely in Norway.¹²

Norway had a small urban population, and the fact that only three percent of the land was arable made land a much desired, but not easily obtained, commodity.¹³ An increase in population forced many peasants off the land and into the towns. These migrants broke their old ties with their land and friends; they were strangers in the towns. Often they were unwelcome for they made life more difficult for those who were native to the town. This condition made it easier for them to consider immigration to America.¹⁴

Since the Norwegians' rural background had usually confined them to less than five acres, the great stretches of land in America were especially appealing to them. Furthermore, many young Norwegians were refusing to become tenant farmers as their fathers had been; they refused to be bound by inelastic contracts, the terms of which they regarded as conditions of slavery. The abundance of land, enticing American wages, and tickets for transportation to America which their friends or relatives sent to them encouraged their emigration from Norway.¹⁵

One must consider also that immigration from Norway to the United States during the years 1869 to 1873, and 1878 to 1883 increased enormously. During these periods a number of those who left for America were land-holding peasants that had been forced to leave their farms because they were unable to pay the mortgages on them.¹⁶ This condition accounted for the majority of those who directly immigrated from Norway to Dakota.

In addition, the railroads, eager to find a home for these dissatisfied people, provided incentives for them. The railroads estimated that in the long run each settler meant a profit of \$200 to \$300 a year. The railroads prepared handbooks printed in Norwegian and sent special agents to Norway to induce immigration to America.¹⁷ The Northern Pacific Railroad sold its lands on attractive installment terms: ten percent down and seven years to pay the balance, with free transportation for the new landowners to their land. Many purchased railroad lands but the majority homesteaded, especially during the early settlement of Dakota.¹⁸

In the late 1870's the Dakota territorial government created an immigration bureau in order that the territory might receive its fair share of immigrants and thus, move closer to statehood. This desire to increase its population was exemplified by a certain intoxicated Dakota legislator when he declared, "What Dakota needed was less brains and more children...." He then struck his fist on the desk and moved that, "the legislature adjourn and take Indian wives and go out populating the country."¹⁹

The Norwegian immigrants from the late 1870's to 1900 usually came by the ships of either the Cunard Line or the White Star Line and landed in Boston or New York. They proceeded by rail through Chicago and Minneapolis. A large number of the Norwegians who immigrated to North Dakota from other states during the 1870's and 1880's came by oxen and wagon; however, a higher percentage came by rail.²⁰

The cost of the journey varied from \$30 to \$60 for passage between one of the Scandinavian ports and New York or Boston. Reduced rates caused by rate wars among steamship lines and railroads enabled a person to get to St. Paul, Minnesota from Norway for about \$50.²¹ The prices climbed to higher levels but usually the cost ranged between \$50 and \$75. The settlers usually brought between \$22 and \$70 with them.²²

Some farmers and railroad workers in Norway were able to save enough money in a year to make the journey to America.²³ The men made the journey, worked in America, and then sent funds to their families to make the trip. Many borrowed the money from friends or relatives in the United States. The American consuls in Norway reported that approximately one-half of the emigrants from Norway to the United States in 1891 made the journey on tickets sent by friends and relatives in America.²⁴

In America the immigrants earned as high as \$30 a month for farm work and were able to save \$200 a year. Carpenters and common laborers were able to save over \$100 a year. Workers on bonanza farms in the Dakota Territory received about \$18 a month with room and board.²⁵ In the United States the Norwegian immigrant made higher wages and saved more money than would have been possible in Norway. Many were able to buy the two main farming essentials, a team of oxen costing between \$110 and \$160 and a plow costing approximately \$28. In many instances, pairs or groups of settlers combined their resources and bought these commodities for common use.

Norwegian homesteaders who migrated from other states frequently came equipped for farming. One fortunate couple, on their journey to Dakota, rented land in Minnesota, and during one year harvested a crop of wheat which they sold at a good price. When they prepared to depart for Dakota in the spring of 1893, they had a "fine team of horses, several head of cattle, farm machinery, lumber for building posts and barbed wire for fencing, and hay and feed for the stock."²⁷ Norwegian cattle raisers in Dakota had usually migrated from some other state where they had accumulated their stock.

The first Norwegians settled in the Red River Valley region of Dakota like most other pioneers. As they moved westward they determined their choice of homes, to a large extent, by the rivers in the state. Being accustomed to wooded areas, they were difficult to convince that the prairie could be as fertile and productive as the wooded regions.²⁸ The old prejudice against the prairie broke down, still the Norwegian pioneers preferred river valleys, especially the Red River and its various tributaries.²⁹ The Norwegians had followed this same pattern of settlement near rivers in their earlier eastern settlements.

By 1890, the Norwegians pioneered the desirable agricultural areas in the eastern two-thirds of North Dakota. Settlement generally followed the water courses, while rail lines became the second consideration. Good farming land with plenty of wood and water comprised the primary factor in the Norwegian pioneer's selection of a place to settle and make a home. The Norwegian settlements in the southern and western parts of North Dakota prior to 1890 resulted from railroad expansion into those regions.³⁰ Norwegian settlement in the western part of the state did not substantially occur until the 1890's and continued in that area until the outbreak of World War I.

The first Norwegian farmer settled in North Dakota in 1861. However, the first Norwegians in the 1860's were young soldiers who served the United States government at such places as Fort Sully, Fort Thompson, and Fort Randal.³¹ In fact, the first Norwegian buried in the Red River Valley region was a soldier named Lund, who was originally from Stravanger, Norway. Norwegians like Iver Furuness and Halvor Aune experienced adventure on the military frontier.³² As mentioned earlier, however, substantial Norwegian settlement began in the 1870's. More seasonable weather and the elimination of the Indian threat made the territory more attractive to farmers.

Many found it necessary to work for extra money in addition to running their homesteads. Many new Norwegian settlers continued to work for the United States government at some of the forts. Some acted as assistants and managers for government agents, as well as their intermediaries with the Indians.³³ Others provided services for the military outposts, or worked on the cargo boats on the Red and Missouri Rivers. Some Norwegians trapped and hunted while working their homesteads.³⁴ In many cases they would spend all winter and part of the summer away from their homestead laboring in some other locality while their friends kept watch on their place.

The pioneers who acquired land along the river built log cabins, while those farther out on the prairie generally erected sod huts or dug-out cellar houses. In the 1870's and the early 1880's, they usually plowed from five to seven acres the first year. In two or three years they expanded by cultivating from ten to twenty acres.³⁶ In later years the amount of land cultivated increased with the use of better farming equipment.

Before 1876, they carried on a diversified arming operation because of the inadequate and high-price transportation facilities, lack of markets, and the continued rampages of grasshoppers.³⁷ They raised mixed portions of wheat, barley, oats, corn, and potatoes. In the late 1870's they began to raise wheat as a staple crop, harvesting around twenty bushels per acre during good years. During the depression years of 1892 to 1895, the land yielded from ten to thirteen bushels per acre. After the depression, a period of good crops and high prices continued until 1900.³⁸

The first two years were rather difficult for the Norwegian homesteader. Since the land usually did not yield any crops of great importance during this time, they were dependent on savings.³⁹ Patience and hard work were generally rewarded as one writer stated:

Most of them come with just enough to get on Government land and build a shack.... Now they are loaning money to their less fortunate neighbors.... Every county has Norwegians who are worth from \$25,000 to \$50,000 all made since settling in North Dakota.⁴⁰

Statistics from Griggs County demonstrate that the average size of a Norwegian farm increased from 180 acres in 1888-1890 to 293 acres by 1904.⁴¹

However, for many Norwegian farmers, wheat farming in Dakota was a new and frustrating experience.⁴² One Norwegian wrote that if the trials and difficulties of pioneer life "were better known in dear old Norway it would probably act as a damper on the craze for America."⁴³

The rugged environment destroyed many physically and mentally. Among the foreign-born settlers in the Middle West, Norwegians and other Scandinavians had the highest rates of insanity. The reason was simple. The Norwegians came from happy little farm villages. Life in Norway was tough, but it was not lonesome.⁴⁴ In Rolvaag's Giants of the Earth, the character Beret became insane because of the awesome loneliness she encountered on the isolate great plains and her regret at leaving Norway. Many Norwegian mental patients believed that the hot weather or a sunstroke caused their mental breakdown.⁴⁵ Whatever the cause, the new environment destroyed many of the weaker Norwegians.

The Norwegians eliminated some of the loneliness on the frontier by settling close together or by forming Norwegian communities. Some Norwegian groups left the fatherland, sailed on the same ship, and settled in America in one unit. They associated themselves with people who came from their community in Norway. The Norwegian settlers in Griggs County came as a transplanted colony from Stravanger, Norway, and were joined by small settlements that moved from Fillmore County, Minnesota and northern Iowa.⁴⁶ One group of Norwegians left one settlement because they were not able to find adjoining homesteads for their friends.⁴⁷ A few groups would send someone to travel ahead to find an area which they could settle together in a complete neighborhood of friends.⁴⁸ The settlers, so far from the fatherland, were paranoid of people whom they did not know. They wanted to be surrounded by people on whom they could rely, when the need arose.

Although the Norwegians generally settled with other Norwegians, they occasionally settled with other nationalities. Several Norwegian and German farmers jointly settled on what was later the town of Canton. The one group of people the Norwegian pioneers were reluctant to settle among were the Irish.⁴⁹

Other groups settled according to their nationality just as the Norwegians did, and possibly even to a stricter degree. A Russian colony of fifty families settled in Norton County; a group of seventy-five Hollander families settled at Crystal Springs in Kidder County.⁵⁰ The German-Russians also formed their own communities.

Settling together in groups enabled the pioneers to help each other. Many tasks were too difficult to perform by a lone homesteader, so a joint effort by the immigrants was needed. At threshing time, all the Norwegians in a community worked on each farm to insure an efficient harvest.⁵¹ They practiced what they called in Norway a "dogna." This corresponded to the American "working bee," a cooperative effort to help someone who had gotten behind in his work. If someone's supplies ran out, he borrowed from his community until he could pay them back.⁵² Joint cooperation for going to the market and picking up the mail was also needed. The settlers needed a coordinated effort so they would not have to neglect their homesteads. Those who first settled in Antelope Valley had to go to Devil's Lake which was ninety miles away for their mail and supplies.⁵³ Another group picked up its mail in Canby, Minnesota, a round trip of one and a half days. These conditions required that members of a community take turns picking up the mail.⁵⁴

One Norwegian settlement jointly plowed a furrow through the prairie from their settlement to the nearest market, a distance of twenty-five or thirty miles. This served to guide the pioneers on their trips to and from town and enabled travelers to find their way to the colony.⁵⁵ The success which many Norwegians achieved undoubtedly depended upon their ability to work together during hardships and times of adversity.

Norwegian bachelors even formed their own settlements. A group of twenty bachelors acquired homestead land and worked on the railroads to earn extra money. Many Norwegian bachelors homesteaded, and one witness recalled that his community contained thirteen bachelors.⁵⁶

The Bureau of Census reported that there were 25,773 foreign-born Norwegians (of a total population of 182,719) in North Dakota in 1890.⁵⁷ Including the second generation, Norwegians comprised thirty percent of the total population in North Dakota.⁵⁸ In 1900, the number of foreign-born Norwegians had increased to 33,728.⁵⁹

In their first years of settlement, the Norwegians, even with their numbers, did not attempt to control local or state politics, which would have been easy enough to do. Since they made no attempt to dominate the political scene, they did not antagonize the other nationalities in North Dakota. The Norwegian appeared to the general population as an easy-going individual who chose to leave everyone else alone in order to be left alone. Thus, the Norwegian immigrants blended into the general population through the political system.

The passive attitude toward politics displayed by the Norwegians resulted from a lack of experience, not choice. The Norwegians' familiarity with national or state politics had been severely restricted. In Norway, only high-level government employees, certain landowners, and parts of the merchant class had the privilege of voting in national elections. In 1884, men with a certain minimum annual income obtained the right to vote, but property qualifications were not removed until 1898.⁶⁰

Norwegians joined the Republican Party because they thought this would make them more acceptable in the eyes of native Americans. As Republicans, the Norwegians became part of a "majority" in the United States. They did not wish to become members of the political party that was out of favor with the American electorate at that time. They gave blind obedience to the Republican Party, usually voting its candidates, "of whose political views they only had a very hazy concept."⁶¹ They were quick to display their

Republican loyalty, and one Norwegian community even named a post office they organized in honor of James Garfield, the Republican presidential candidate that year.⁶² It has been argued that they became Republicans because they associated the Democratic Party with the cause of slavery and with the Irish whom they vehemently despised.⁶³ However, the dominant consideration was the fact that they had no desire to be associated with the Democratic Party, the minority party. Already a minority because of their nationality, the Norwegians did not wish to join another minority and alienate the population.

A Republican, very pleased with the Norwegians' voting, issued the following statement:

It was indeed gratifying to see our Scandinavian friends come to the polls and cast a republican (sic) ballot scarcely marred with the pencil. These sturdy sons of Scandinavia never enjoyed the privilege of a free and protected government until they set foot on American soil and that they appreciate our republican form of government manifested itself when they walked up to the ballot box as citizens of the United States and deposited therein their veto to Grover Cleveland's free trade doctrine and his English sympathies. Thank God that these people are enlightened and have the patriotism of the American citizens.... You cannot find one speck of anarchy among these people nor do you hear a single complaint. They love our Stars and Stripes and we welcome them into the republican (sic) fold.⁶⁴

By the late 1880's, the Norwegians finally realized they had helped the Republican Party and received nothing in return. They tired of their passive role in politics and aspired to the benefits of political power. One Norwegian politician stated the case frankly: "The Scandinavians constitute a majority of the Republican Party in North Dakota. Under the territorial government they have not received many official favors.... We have the numerical strength to demand and secure justice, and all we ask is for fair play."⁶⁵ For a remedy in the late 1880's and early 1890's, they formed Viking leagues and tried to concentrate "Scandinavian political power to gain political offices and win social equality."⁶⁶ The Viking leagues seldom obtained the successful results the Norwegians desired.

The Norwegians' most dismal political failure occurred at the state constitutional convention in 1889. Of the seventy-five delegates, fifty-two had been born in the United States, and only ten came from Scandinavian countries.⁶⁷

Martin Johnson, who chaired the committee on corporations and helped to frame legislation on public education and prohibition, wielded the greatest influence the Norwegians had at the convention. The success the Norwegians achieved in state and national politics is credited to Johnson. In the 1890's, he served four terms as North Dakota's only congressional representative, and in 1908, he was elected to the Senate.⁶⁸

In local affairs the Norwegians achieved their greatest influence, even though in Norway they had no substantial experience in these matters. They assumed leadership in this area primarily because it was forced on them. It was only when the number of the settlers became overwhelming that they felt compelled to demand the election of one of their countrymen to an office.⁶⁹ One example was in Travill County, where sheer numbers assured the Norwegians control of local affairs. They comprised thirty-five percent of the total population. This represented seventy-six percent of the foreign-born population in the county.⁷⁰ In 1889, the Norwegians held three-fourths of the best offices in that county, including those of sheriff, treasurer, and probate judge.⁷¹

The Norwegian local leaders, for the most part, gained their political experience from other states. Second generation Norwegians achieved greater success and participated more actively in local affairs than those who had directly emigrated from Norway.

The Norwegians had the opportunity to remain informed in politics and local affairs by a substantial Norwegian press. In 1878 immigrant journalism in North Dakota began.⁷² Nearly every Norwegian home received one of the journals or newspapers printed in Norwegian.

Republican Party loyalty dominated the political stances of the newspapers. The Norwegian press, however, generally remained in the left wing of the party and attacked conservative positions. Numerous attempts were made by rightwing Republicans, mainly men without Norwegian background, to solicit the immigrant voters in Norwegian. The Norwegian press lived in continuous fear of having to concede to powerful conservative groups eager to control the policies of the Norwegian-language journals; occasionally they capitulated.⁷³ Two Norwegian newspapers, the Normanden and the Vesten, political organs for the Populist Party, typified this behavior by selling their interests to corporations close to the Republican Party, which in turn attacked the Populist cause.⁷⁴ When Odd S. Levoll, a student of the Norwegian press in North Dakota, contended that the press helped "generate

the agrarian position" he neglected to tell his audience about the damage the press inflicted upon the movement.⁷⁵ The Normanden, the most influential Norwegian paper and the official voice of the Populist Party, undoubtedly hurt the agrarian revolt when it sold out to opposing interests. Furthermore, by this action, the Norwegian press worked against the interests of the Norwegian farmer.

The failure of the Populist movement in North Dakota in part may be traced to the capitulation of the press to the conservative interests. However, the credit for the general failure of the agrarian revolt must remain with the population. The Norwegians comprised nearly one-third of the total population in North Dakota at this time. Norwegian historians who contend that the Norwegian immigrant brought radicalism to North Dakota, fail to note that the Populist movement was short-lived in that state in comparison to the rest of the Mid West; and that the predominance of the Norwegian population evidently was not receptive to the revolt.

The Norwegian press remained more consistent in its support of the temperance movement. This was because the Norwegian immigrants supported the issue. The Secretary of State for North Dakota stated that it was safe "to assume that at least three-fourths of the Scandinavian population favored prohibition and that one-half of them earnestly advocated the law."⁷⁶

The Lutheran Church played a large role in formulating the Norwegian immigrants' ideas on prohibition and other social issues. The state church in Norway, the Lutheran Church, exercised control over its members even to matters of the smallest detail. "The Lutheran Church practiced formalism and, in common with orthodoxy everywhere, preached conformity."⁷⁷ A child had to be baptized or the parents received a fine. When the child reached the age of fourteen or fifteen, he was required by law to be instructed and confirmed by the minister.⁷⁸

The frontier experience gave many a freedom of religious thought they had never experienced. The entrenched values of the church remained, while religious orthodoxy declined. Many immigrants wanted freedom from the hierarchy of the church and obtained it on the North Dakota prairie.⁷⁹ Norwegian Andrew Vatne stated in a letter that because of the new environment, many immigrants reached a "spiritual independence based on the truths of the Bible which they never would have obtained if they remained in Norway."⁸⁰

The religious controversies and schisms that began in the middle of the nineteenth century in Norway spread to

America and the frontier. Divisions had taken place within each of the newly-formed Norwegian Lutheran bodies during the 1870's and 1880's. During the latter decade the Norwegian Lutherans were divided into four different church bodies.⁸¹

These controversies made the members of the pioneer church very militant.⁸² The disputes based on orthodoxy in many cases caused civil strife. Lawrence Larson stated, "In part, these controversies had their root in deep religious convictions; but to a considerable extent they may be ascribed to pioneer individualism."⁸³ There were frequent fights in many communities concerned with the location and form of services.

Many who had been regular church members in Norway refused to attend services in America. Others joined the churches with the intention of withdrawing if ministers preached an objectionable dogma.⁸⁴ A Dakota pioneer pastor of the 1880's, J.J. Ringstad, wrote that oftentimes, "one pastor, with his flock, would wait outside the schoolhouse where the meeting was to be held, while the other pastor concluded his services, and people would meet, while going to and from services."⁸⁵

Even with this religious strife, the church provided the basic spiritual and social needs. Whether the Norwegians held services in log school houses or an immigrant's home, the people were able to mingle with each other, an otherwise rare occurrence.⁸⁶ The church served as the chief unit in the system of defenses, which the pioneers created to stop the advance of an unfamiliar and hostile culture.⁸⁷ The church provided the desperately needed courage to live in a rugged, demanding, and lonely environment.

Language posed a difficult problem for the church. Pastors generally conducted services in Norwegian, although there were exceptions. Reverend Bjug Harstad preached in English, Norwegian, and German to meet the needs of his congregation.⁸⁸ In order to satisfy the church fathers and to minister to the immigrants, as well as to care for the younger generation, the use of two languages was essential. Most of the immigrants became bilingual, learning English while retaining their native language.⁸⁹

The Norwegians learned from their first days in America that they needed to master the English language for business, social, and civic affairs. "English became the language of the pocketbook and the outershell of life without warmth; the old language spoken at home, remained the language of the most intimate and valuable experience."⁹⁰ The clergy and the more conservative members of the Norwegian community condemned the immigrants' acceptance of English, but to no avail.

When groups first arrived in their new frontier communities, they established evening schools so they could learn the English language.⁹¹ The settlers accepted the common school as a necessity, and in many cases the Norwegians became teachers or administrators in charge of the school system. The immigrants' vigorous use of the common school can be traced to their native background. Everyone learned to read in Norway, since a law of 1736 required all persons to be confirmed, and the church required confirmation candidates to be familiar with a large amount of church literature. In 1739, Norway established a public school system.⁹²

Education on the prairie played a decisive role in Americanizing the Norwegian youth. It also affected the older settlers, who became better acquainted with the English language through their children's use of it. However, the Norwegian language remained in use in homes because of its use in religious services and because of the steady immigration of Norwegians from the old country.⁹³

In conclusion, the Norwegian immigrant usually achieved success in becoming a property-owning American. The settlers achieved comparatively higher economic success than possible had they remained in Norway.⁹⁴

By 1900, 49.8 percent of all first generation Norwegians in America owned or managed farms. By 1900, 63 percent of the second generation owned or managed farms. Indeed by the turn of the century, there was a larger proportion of Norwegians in agriculture than of any other ethnic group in the country.⁹⁵

In addition, they provided Norway a service by ridding the small country of excess population and aided America in settling the West.

The immigrants melted into the general population easily. To a large degree, immigrants accepted the language and customs of the American people. "Many Norwegians anglicized their names: for instance, Laverans Fjelstad became Lewis Fisk."⁹⁶ However, many felt they lost something important and irreplaceable when they became an American. One immigrant found that when he returned to Norway, "his mode of thinking and spiritual life changed so much during this thirteen years in America that he did not feel at home with his childhood friends."⁹⁷

Ole Edvart Rolvaag provided Norwegians an articulate and honest spokesman concerning the immigrants' problems in the new land. In his works, he discussed the fundamental problems: "the painful transition into a new culture, the conflict between the first and second generations, the tension

arising from marriages between people of different national and religious heritage."⁹⁸

Up to a point, Rolvaag accepted Norwegian assimilation into the American culture. However, "cultural barrenness of the second generation Norwegian homes he saw when he came to America at the turn of the century appalled him."⁹⁹ "Rolvaag saw the immigrant essentially as a tragic figure, severed from one culture, never to be at home in another, living in the past emotionally and only physically in the present."¹⁰⁰

Another Norwegian stated that the American influence left the Immigrant,

...rootless, restless and unable to find peace in the new environment. Norwegians came to America to find a home. Through toil and drudgery many of them found a farm; but very few appeared to find a 'home' in the proper sense of the word. The farm was always for sale as long as a sufficiently high bid was made for it. The old homestead did not seem to have any value, unless it was expressed in dollars.¹⁰¹

FOOTNOTES

1. Carlton C. Qualey, "Pioneer Norwegian Settlement in North Dakota," North Dakota Historical Quarterly, V (Oct. 1929), 16.
2. Ibid., 16-17.
3. Ibid., 16.
4. Elwyn B. Robinson, History of North Dakota, (Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1966), 130-1.
5. Leola Marjorie (Nelson) Bergmann, Americans from Norway, (Philadelphia, 1950), 101.
6. Carl M. Grimstad, "Pioneers in Dakota Territory 1879-89," memoirs edited by Henry H. Bakken, Norwegian-American Studies and Records, XIII (Northfield, Minn., 1943), 4.
7. Bergmann, Americans from Norway, 100-1.
8. G.O. Sandro, The Immigrants Trek, (Sioux Falls, S. D., 1929), 18-19.
9. Jon Wefald, A Voice of Protest: Norwegians in American Politics 1890-1917, (Northfield, Minn., 1971), 9.
10. Ingrid Gaustad Semmingsen, "Norwegian Immigration to America During the Nineteenth Century.," Translated by Einar Haugen. Norwegian-American Studies and Records, II (Northfield, Minn., 1940), 77.
11. Omon B. Herigstad, "Norwegian Immigration," North Dakota Historical Society Collections, II (Fargo, 1910), 192.
12. Omon B. Herigstad, "The First Norwegian Settlement in Griggs County, North Dakota," North Dakota Historical Society Collections, I (Bismark, 1906), 131-2, 196.
13. The Norway Year Book, (Oslo, 1962), 305; Arne Hassing, "Norway's Organized Response to Emigration," Norwegian-American Studies and Records, XXV (Northfield, Minn., 1972), 79; Babcock, Scandinavian Element, 19. In 1880, 20% lived in towns. In 1890, 23.9% lived in towns.
14. Semmingsen, "Norwegian Emigration," 79.
15. Ibid., 76-77, 80-81
16. Herigstad, "Griggs County," 131-2.
17. Charles Kendric Babcock, The Scandinavian Element in the United States, (New York, 1969), 87, 88.

18. Robinson, History of North Dakota, 131.
19. Bruce Nelson, Land of the Dakotas, (Minneapolis, 1946), 118.
20. Herigstad, "Norwegian Immigration," 195; Qualey, "Pioneer Norwegian Settlement," 24-5.
21. Babcock, Scandinavian Element, 34; Herigstad, "Griggs County," 136.
22. Babcock, Scandinavian Element, 93.
23. Herigstad, "Norwegian Immigration," 195.
24. Babcock, Scandinavian Element, 94.
25. Herigstad, "Norwegian Immigration," 196; John L. Coulter, "Industrial History of the Vall of the Red River of the North," North Dakota Historical Society Collections III (Fargo, 1910), 578.
26. Alma Tweto, "History of Abercombie Township, Richland County," North Dakota Historical Society Collections, III, 166-167.
27. Barbara Levorsen, "Early Years in Dakota," Norwegian-American Studies and Records, XXI (Northfield, Minn., 1962), 159.
28. Qualey, "Pioneer Norwegian Settlement," 18.
29. Theodore C. Blegen, Norwegian Migration to America: The American Transition, (Northfield, Minn., 1940), 507.
30. Qualey, "Pioneer Norwegian Settlement," 35-36.
31. Ibid., 26-7; Blegen, The American Transition, 501.
32. Axel Toffelson, "Historical Notes on the Norwegians in the Red River Valley," North Dakota Historical Collections, (Grand Forks, 1924), VII, 147; Blegen, The American Transition, 501.
33. Einar Haugen, "Norwegians at the Indian Forts on the Missouri River during the Seventies," Norwegian Studies and Records, (Northfield, Minn., 1936), VI, 113.
34. Sandro, The Immigrants' Trek, 24.
35. Herigstad, "Griggs County," 137.
36. Sandro, "The Immigrants' Trek," 32.
37. Coulter, "Industrial History," 566; Harold E. Briggs, "The Great Dakota Boom, 1879-1886," North Dakota Historical Quarterly, III (Bismark, Jan., 1930), III, 79.

38. Coulter, "Industrial History," 629, 666.
39. John H. Blegen, "A Missionary Journey on the Dakota Prairies in 1886," translated by Theodore C. Blegen, North Dakota Historical Quarterly, I (April, 1927), I, 24; Briggs, "Great Dakota Boom," 79.
40. Babcock, Scandinavian Element, 97-8.
41. Herigstad, "Griggs County," 148.
42. Kenneth Bjork, "West of the Great Divide; Norwegian Migration to the Pacific Coast 1847-1893, (Northfield, Minn., 1958), 17.
43. Herigstad, "Griggs County," 138-9.
44. E. V. Smalley, "The Desolation of Life on Prairie Farms," Atlantic Monthly, 72 (1893), 380; Hergmann, Americans from Norway, 133; Smalley, "Life on Prairie Farms," 380.
45. Bergmann, Americans from Norway, 133.
46. Wefald, A Voice of Protest, 11; Qualey, "Pioneer Norwegian Settlement," 30.
47. Sandro. "Immigrants' Trek," 13.
48. Grimstad, "Pioneers in Dakota," 27.
49. Harold E. Briggs, "The Settlement and Development of the Territory of Dakota, 1860-70," North Dakota Historical Quarterly, VII (April, 1933), VII, 136.
50. The Mandan Weekly Pioneer, April 25, 1885; The Dakota Settler, (Bismark), March 17, April 14, December 8, 1887; Briggs, "The Great Dakota Boom," 88-89.
51. Barbara Levorsen, "Our Bread and Meat," Norwegian-American Studies and Records, XXII (Northfield, Minn., 1965), 183.
52. Herigstad, "Griggs County," 144.
53. Blegen, "Missionary Journey," 24-5.
54. Sandro, Immigrants' Trek, 34.
55. Ibid., 33.
56. Blegen, "Missionary Journey," 21; Levorsen, "Early Years in Dakota," 180-~~181~~.
57. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Eleventh Census of the United States: 1890. Population (25 vols., Washington, 1894), Vol., I, p. 607.
58. Qualey, "Pioneer Norwegian Settlement," 36-7

59. Population, Twelvth Census of the United States (Washington, 1900), I, 811.
60. James A. Storing, Norwegian Democracy (Boston, 1963), 59.
61. A. Lewenhaupt, "An Official Report on Norwegian and Swedish Immigration, 1870," Norwegian-American Studies and Records (Northfield, Minn., 1943), XIII, 59.
62. Grimstad, "Pioneers in Dakota," 30.
63. Wefald, Voice of Protest, 19.
64. Editorial from Abercrombie Herald, Nov. 16, 1888; Herigstad, "Grigs County," 176.
65. Babcock, Scandinavian Element, 174-75.
66. Scandinavian, May 18, 1898; Wefald, Voice of Protest, 25.
67. Robinson, History of North Dakota, 208.
68. Arlow William Anderson, The Salt of the Earth: A History of Norwegian-Danish Methodism in America (Nashville, 1962), 21.
69. Lewenhaupt, "Norwegian and Swedish Immigration," 59.
70. Jesse A. Tanner, "Foreign Immigration in North Dakota," North Dakota Historical Society Collections, I (Bismark, 1906), 187.
71. Wefald, Voice of Protest, 22.
72. Odd Sverre Lvoll, "The Norwegian Press in North Dakota," Norwegian-American Studies and Records, XXIV (Northfield, Minn., 1970), XXIV, 79, 81.
73. Ibid., 81, 85.
74. Ibid., 82-84.
75. Ibid., 81.
76. Letter from C.M. Dahl, March 24, 1896: Babcock, Scandinavian Element.
77. Arlo William Anderson, The Immigrant Takes His Stand: The Norwegian-American Press and Public Affairs, 1847-1872 (Northfield, Minn., 1953), 157.
78. Letter from Andrew Vatne, 1907, Appendix, Herigstad, "Norwegian Immigration," 201.
79. Anderson, The Immigrant Takes His Stand, 157.
80. Herigstad, "Norwegian Immigration," 200.

81. Anton Hillesland, "The Norwegian Lutheran Church in the Red River Valley," North Dakota Historical Society Collections, (Grand Forks, 1924), VII, 206-117.
82. Laurence M. Larson, "The Collection and Preservation of Sources," Norwegian American Studies and Records, IX (Northfield, Minn., 1936), 98-99.
83. Ibid., 98-99
84. Blegen, "Missionary Journey," 21.
85. Bergmann, Americans from Norway, 155.
86. Tweto, "History of Abercrombie Township," 165; Herigstad, "Griggs County," 139.
87. Laurence M. Larson, The Changing West and other Essays (Northfield, Minn., 1937), 74.
88. Robinson, History of North Dakota, 293.
89. Hillesland, "The Norwegian Butheran Church," 232; Robinson, History of North Dakota, 290.
90. Robinson, History of North Dakota, 290.
91. Hergstad, "Griggs County," 145-6.
92. Robinson, Hisotry of North Dakota, 283.
93. Herigstad, "Griggs County," 145-6, 141.
94. Lewenhaupt, "Norwegian and Swedish Immigration," 53.
95. Knut Gjerset, History of the Norwegian People, 605; Norlie, Norwegian People in America, 312, 347; Wefald, Voice of Protest, 10.
96. Robinson, History of North Dakota, 172.
97. Letter from Andrew Vatne, "Norwegian Immigration," 200.
98. Bergmann, Americans from Norway, 133.
99. Ibid., 140-1.
100. Ibid., 133.
101. Arne Hassing, "Norway's Organized Response to Emigration," Norwegian-American Studies and Records, XXV (Northfield, Minn., 1972), 69-70.

PUBLIC OPINION, THE PRESS
AND THE DREYFUS AFFAIR

The Dreyfus Affair was an agonizing experience for Alfred Dreyfus, his family, and, most of all, France. The Affair, as it came to be called, profoundly affected the Army, the government of France, and French society itself. It cut across political affiliations and divided families. Public opinion played a very important part in Dreyfus' arrest, conviction, and retrial. The press was largely responsible for public attitudes and opinions concerning the Affair, and the Dreyfus case presents a clear picture of a society unduly influenced by a reckless and vicious press.

Alfred Dreyfus, a brilliant young Army officer and the first Jew ever to serve on the French Army General Staff, was arrested on October 15, 1894 and charged with high treason.¹ A few days after his arrest, press rumors began to grow. On November 1, La Libre Parole, a newspaper edited by Edouard Drumont, a vicious anti-Semite, created a sensation with the headline: "High Treason: Arrest of the Jewish Officer, A. Dreyfus."² Any charge of treason was enough to stir public opinion, and the fact that Dreyfus was a Jew only inflamed opinion further.

Fear and hatred of the Jew was as old as France, but anti-Semitism had ceased to be very important because of the activities of the Rothschilds and other French-Jewish families.³ A renaissance of hatred began in 1881, however, with the collapse of the Union Generale, a corporation founded by a Jew with heavy Catholic investment.⁴ Also, the Panama Canal scandal in 1890-92 involved a number of Jewish financiers and stimulated the fear of an international Jewish "Syndicate" dedicated to France's downfall.⁵ Edouard Drumont began publishing La Libre Parole in April, 1892 with a series of articles on Jewish infiltration of the Army.⁶ These articles, along with the public scandal over the Panama Affair and the presence of a number of Jews in the banking industry and the intellectual professions, coincided with a period of great, unfathomable change for most Frenchmen. The French were caught up in a disquieting mood, and anti-Semitism served as a convenient outlet for their feelings.⁷

However, the dark, anti-Semitic blot on the case came not from the Army but from the press. True, anti-Semitism

existed in the Army, and even some of Dreyfus' fellow officers on the General Staff felt that there were situations where persons who were not incontrovertibly French ought not to be placed.⁸ Undoubtedly, the fact that Dreyfus was a Jew influenced his arrest, but it was not the Army's dominant motive. The Army, led by General Mercier, the War Minister, felt that its reputation and integrity was threatened by any case of espionage. Under these circumstances, the traitor had to be discovered at all costs, and Alfred Dreyfus, the Jew on the General Staff, was the Army's victim.

The central document in the Army's case was an undated, handwritten bordereau (outline) listing five supposedly classified military items transmitted to the Germans by a French officer.⁹ Dreyfus himself prepared a written critique of the document showing the similarity of his handwriting and that of the bordereau, but also showing many dissimilarities.¹⁰ However, the General Staff had willed itself into believing the lies and rumors contained in its investigative reports. The reputation of the Army and the careers of many high-ranking officers were at stake. There was no turning back now.

The press raged all through the month of November. The most fantastic stories were filed by journalists concerning the secrets sold by Dreyfus and the reason for his treacherous conduct. The conflicting press stories, the mystery surrounding the case, and the duration of the preliminary examination stirred public opinion deeply. People failed to understand, in view of the press's assurance of Dreyfus' guilt, why a conviction had not yet been obtained.¹¹

Dreyfus' trial began on December 18, 1894.¹² The defense lawyer demolished the government's case and things looked bright for an acquittal.¹³ However, the seven military judges were given secret information from the Minister of War after they had retired to chambers.¹⁴ In effect, they were told that if they acquitted Dreyfus, they would be flouting the Minister of War.¹⁵ The officers of the court-martial were men who understood the meaning of order, discipline, and hierarchy, and they had no other choice except to convict Dreyfus. Alfred Dreyfus was found guilty, sentenced to public dishonor and life imprisonment in a fortified place.¹⁶

The people and press of Paris accepted the verdict enthusiastically, and a great crowd gathered for his degradation. The masses regarded the degradation as an exquisitely appropriate ceremony for a traitor, and as proof of French solidarity and determination to destroy the tentacles of Judaism that they alleged to be strangling France.¹⁷ Newspapers reported that shouts of "Death to the traitor!"

and "Kill him!" were heard and that the police were hard pressed to restrain the mob from wreaking their own brand of justice.¹⁸ Dreyfus' protestations of innocence at the ceremony perhaps had an unsettling effect on those present, yet most people still accepted the verdict without question. A few weeks after the ceremony, Dreyfus was transported to Devil's Island where he served five incredible years of torment, torture, and exile.¹⁹

The Dreyfus family tried to enlist the help of a number of politicians and journalists to reopen the case but were rebuffed. The Paris press, which normally alighted upon any hint of political scandal, turned a deaf ear to all the Dreyfus family's pleas. Neither Le Figaro nor Le Journal, respected and influential newspapers, would review the case or publish articles concerning it.²⁰ Yves Guyot, the editor of Le Siecle, was reported to defend unpopular causes, but he advised the family against any effort of a press campaign on Dreyfus' behalf.²¹ The current against Dreyfus was so strong that only discovery of the truly guilty party could have changed the antipathy of the French.

Mathieu Dreyfus, Alfred's brother, disregarded Guyot's advice and, on September 3, 1896, had an English newspaper publish a report of Dreyfus' escape from Devil's Island.²² The French government promptly denied the escape, but the article had the desired effect of reviving interest in the case.²³ After an appeal for a retrial was rejected, Mathieu made further plans to publicize the case. In November, 1896, Bernard Lazare, a Jewish journalist, wrote a pamphlet enumerating the errors of the case, denying the authenticity of the bordereau, and proving Dreyfus had been convicted on secret information.²⁴ Each member of the Chamber and Senate, in addition to journalists, academicians, and high-ranking officers, received a copy.²⁵ The press condemned the work, dismissing it as a new maneuver by international Jewry to create public doubt about Dreyfus' guilt.²⁶

On November 10, 1896, a copy of the Dreyfus bordereau appeared in Le Matin.²⁷ Paul de Cassagnac, the editor of L'Autorite, the voice of responsible nationalism, began to voice his doubts about the case after the publication of the bordereau.²⁸ However, pro-Dreyfus sentiment was still very much in the minority.

Meanwhile, in mid-March, 1896, Major Georges Picquart, new Chief of the Counterintelligence Section of the General Staff, obtained a note from the German Embassy addressed to major Marie Charles Walsin-Esterhazy, the subsequently proven traitor of the Dreyfus Affair.²⁹ Picquart decided to investigate Esterhazy. He examined Esterhazy's correspondence and knew he had seen the handwriting before--in the Dreyfus case.³⁰ He examined the Army's secret dossier on the Dreyfus

case and was astounded when the handwriting of the border-eau and Esterhazy's handwriting were compared and found identical.³¹ He was also horrified at the flimsiness of the evidence against Dreyfus. He reported his feelings to his superiors but was told to forget the Dreyfus case and concentrate on Esterhazy.³² However, Picquart, fearing that the Dreyfus family would expose the truth via newspaper and embarrass the Army, and knowing his career would receive a boost if he freed Dreyfus and convicted Esterhazy, pressed the issue further, much to the dismay of the General Staff. They dispatched him to Tunisia and encouraged Major Henry, Picquart's subordinate, to find documentary evidence against Dreyfus.³³ Henry gladly obliged them and blatantly doctored or manufactured evidence against Dreyfus.³⁴

In June, 1897, Picquart, after much soul-searching, sent a resume of his findings to his attorney in Paris, who, in turn, confided them to Senator Scheurer-Kestner, the Vice-President of the Senate.³⁵ The Senator disclosed these findings to a few trusted friends and associates, among them, Emile Zola, an internationally renowned French author.³⁶

On November 14, Scheurer-Kestner sent a letter to Le Temps claiming that the bordereau was not written by Dreyfus, and that the real traitor was still at large.³⁷ This disclosure began to excite public opinion and tension increased daily. The dominant notes were doubt, surprise, and anxiety; yet, no one dared question the integrity of the military judges. Stories of Dreyfus' innocence began circulating in salons and diplomatic circles; talk, for the first time in years, was not of literature or philosophy, love or adultery, but of Dreyfus.³⁸

Zola, who was first attracted by the drama of the Affair and not by the importance of truth and justice, actively entered the fray when he defended Dreyfus in a series of articles in Le Figaro in late November, 1897.³⁹ His new novel, Paris, was to have been the literary sensation of the winter, but his defense of Dreyfus relegated it to the background.⁴⁰ The case became the primary topic of conversation after Zola wrote "J'Accuse" in January, 1898.⁴¹ It was a magnificent enumeration of specific wrongdoings which became the revolutionary litany of Dreyfus supporters.

"J'Accuse" was published in L'Aurore, the Parisian newspaper edited by Georges Clemenceau, an ex-Deputy. Clemenceau agreed to publish it since it seemed a likely opportunity for revenge against the Nationalists, his traditional enemies.⁴² Clemenceau soon became convinced,

however, that the case endangered the whole fabric of the French Republic.⁴³

It is difficult to comprehend the sensation produced by "J'Accuse." It had the effect of a combined attack of cavalry, infantry, and artillery on a battlefield already prepared by bombardment.⁴⁴ It became popular with many people because it gave them something consistent to believe in the face of all the conflicting evidence.⁴⁵

"J'Accuse" was also a signal to the anti-Semites. Jules Guerin, leader of the anti-Semites in France, organized a series of anti-Jewish demonstrations throughout France. Vicious free-for-alls broke out between anti-Semites and Anarchists; students continually led anti-Zola riots; there was even a melee and a fist fight in the Chamber of Deputies.⁴⁶ The name Zola became a chant of hate for the mobs. Gangs paraded the streets and burned Zola in effigy.⁴⁷ La Libre Parole called for the ransacking of his house and even his assassination.⁴⁸

While Paris society was convulsed over "J'Accuse," Major Esterhazy was brought to trial.⁴⁹ As his trial approached, the entire country rang with the Affair. His trial resembled a judicial carnival more than a serious legal proceeding, and it produced an extraordinary public reaction. Many Frenchmen were much more ready to accept the guilt of a Jew than to doubt the integrity of an officer descended from one of Europe's great houses.⁵⁰ Not surprisingly, Esterhazy was acquitted and treated like a national hero.⁵¹

The government of the Third Republic, that unglamorous, crisis-ridden, and scandal-rocked institution, would have preferred to ignore Zola's challenge, but the clamor within France and the international attention drawn by "J'Accuse" forced it to act. Accordingly, Zola was indicted for libel and brought to trial in February, 1898.⁵²

A great crowd gathered for his trial. The courtroom was invaded by journalists, society women, and other thrill-seekers. Jules Guerin stationed bands of anti-Semite toughs outside the Palace of Justice ready to cheer or hiss any recognized personage.⁵³ Pro-Zola witnesses were jeered and assaulted. The Dreyfusards, supporters of Dreyfus, believed that Zola might be acquitted, but they failed to take into account the power of the anti-Dreyfus press, which abridged reports, omitted awkward statements, and enlarged favorable ones.⁵⁴

At the trial, the Army turned the Dreyfus Affair from a debate over a supposed miscarriage of justice in the case of a Jewish army officer into an issue of national honor, order, and survival.⁵⁵ Order, expediency, and military wis-

dom were substituted for the ideals of liberty, fraternity, and civilian sovereignty. Zola's trial was really over before it began; he was convicted and fled to exile in England.⁵⁶

The anti-revisionists gloried in Zola's conviction and believed agitation for revision to be dead. However, Zola's trial demonstrated that much about the Dreyfus case was being concealed. Immediately after the trial, the League for the Defense of the Rights of Man and the Citizen came into being to agitate for Dreyfus' freedom.⁵⁷ Its earliest members were intellectuals, a few serious writers, and a few Senators. The League's growth was not rapid, but it had excellent credentials and its influence slowly began to spread.

Not only was the Paris press full of abuse, charges, and counter-charges, but also the foreign press entered the arena with gusto. Instead of confining itself to reports of known facts and day-to-day discussions, the foreign press attacked France as a whole after Zola's conviction. France resented foreign interest in a matter that concerned its national defense.⁵⁸ Hostility abroad only served to strengthen the prevailing opinion about Jewish power throughout the world.

France became a battleground for the forces of propaganda. Everyone had his own opinion to which he clung tenaciously, colored as it was by individual, political, and social prejudice and enormously confused by contradictory evidence in the newspapers. The case was no longer a simple topic of discussion; it was a quarrel. Families were torn apart, engagements broken, and old friendships dissolved. Life consisted of reading the paper of whatever side one favored, arming oneself with arguments, and fighting with fists and words. People stopped reading or going to the theater since no novel or thriller could compete with the drama of the moment.⁵⁹

Agreement on the issue made close friends of those who really did not fit well together. Aristocrats applauded the toughs of the Anti-Semitic League at mass meetings, and conservative intellectuals shared the platform with radicals.⁶⁰ Lectures at universities frequently degenerated into street fights, and there were frequent duels over newspaper articles.⁶¹

France, the nation of reason, went mad. Normal activity was disrupted as the country was divided into two hostile camps--those who demanded revision of the case and those who were determined to prevent it; those who attached supreme value to justice for the individual and those who would subordinate individual rights to the best interests

of the state.

Among the educated, the case became a dividing sword. It ceased to be a question of Dreyfus' guilt or innocence. The real question was: should the Army, which to many people meant France itself, endanger itself and its prestige and weaken its self-confidence merely to remedy a hypothetical injustice?⁶²

In August, 1898, Major Henry's forgeries were exposed by a member of an Army investigation team, and Henry was arrested and taken to prison, where he subsequently committed suicide.⁶³ The anti-Dreyfus press glorified Henry as a martyr in a holy cause. Charles Maurras, an obscure poet and journalist and a vicious anti-Semite, wrote a series of inflammatory articles, "The First Blood," for La Gazette de France.⁶⁴ In them, Maurras exalted Henry and stated that a man who merely forged evidence proving a Jew's guilt was not a criminal but a patriot.⁶⁵ La Libre Parole began a national subscription drive for Madame Henry and her children, and it resulted in one of the most outrageous, unbelievable anti-Semite campaigns ever witnessed. The remarks made by contributors to the fund reveal a deep vein of abuse, vileness, and prejudice in French society.⁶⁶ Labor conflicts, strikes, and amateur plottings made people fear that the France of autumn, 1898 would soon experience another 1789.⁶⁷ Riots continued, and it was feared that martial law would be proclaimed.

In September, 1898, the Cabinet voted to transmit a request for the opening of the Dreyfus case to the Court of Cassation.⁶⁸ Although intellectuals, students, and other Dreyfusards exulted, public opinion remained fixed against Dreyfus. Ardent Nationalists could not give up their beliefs overnight, and Maurras' articles in La Gazette were providing them with sustenance.⁶⁹ The principal Catholic newspaper, La Croix, continued its anti-Dreyfus campaign, and each week it became more outspoken in its defense of the Army.⁷⁰

When the investigator for the Court of Cassation said a retrial was justified, the Nationalists were outraged. They accused the Court of being bought by Rothschild money.⁷¹ L'Autorite warned the Court that if it voided Dreyfus' verdict, the nation would void the Court's decision.⁷²

Even the appearance in January, 1899 of a book by Esterhazy, Le Dessous de l'Affair Dreyfus (The Underside of the Dreyfus Case), in which he admitted writing the bordereau, did not change the Nationalist sympathies.⁷³ The Ligue de la Patrie Francaise (League of the French Fatherland), the Nationalist counterpart to the League for the Rights of Man, was founded the same month.⁷⁴

On June 3, 1899, Dreyfus' conviction was annulled by the Court of Cassation, and the case remanded to the military authorities at Rennes.⁷⁵ The decision of the Court enraged the Nationalists, and their hate became focused on the current President of the Third Republic, Emile Loubet. In a dramatic incident, Loubet was insulted in public and then caned at a steeplechase by a group of fanatic young Nationalist aristocrats.⁷⁶ This was a turning point for the Dreyfusards. Whatever Frenchmen's sympathies about Dreyfus, only a few could condone this embarrassing outburst, and more and more people joined the ranks of the Dreyfusards.

Dreyfus reached France on June 30, 1899 and was quickly and quietly spirited away to Rennes to stand trial. The mood of the French people ranged from jubilation to resignation to desperate indignation--with many more resigned than jubilant. The Anti-Dreyfusards kept busy; the League of the French Fatherland became more irrational and Anti-Semitic.

Hordes of foreign journalists, all in support of Dreyfus, descended on Rennes, a sleepy little town with a rather disinterested populace, to report the trial. The trial opened on August 8, 1899, and it mesmerized the world for 32 days.⁷⁸ Many Dreyfusards felt that the trial would be a mere formality, leading to a triumphant acquittal. The more realistic felt otherwise. The trial was a farce, with much irrelevant and disputatious material admitted as evidence.⁷⁹ G. W. Steevens, a foreign journalist, reported that the trial actually came to be a bore because of the mass of misinformation presented and the acceptance by the court of trivialities as evidence.⁸⁰ The officers of the court-martial were pressured to convict Dreyfus, not on the evidence presented, but on fear of compromising senior Army officers and the social ostracism and career damage that would follow acquittal.

Dreyfus was re-convicted on September 9, 1899.⁸¹ The verdict was greeted with enthusiasm by the anti-Dreyfus press. The offices of La Libre Parole, Le Soir, and Le Petit Journal were brightly lighted and decorated with flags.⁸² To them, the Army was saved and, with it, France. However, many Frenchmen were embarrassed by the verdict and the international outcry it raised. France was exhausted by the Affair. Most Frenchmen believed the ideal end to the affair to be clemency for Dreyfus, a moratorium on debate on the issue and a general amnesty in time for the Paris Exposition.⁸³

On September 19, 1899, Dreyfus received a pardon, which he accepted largely because of broken health.⁸⁴ After his acceptance of the pardon, many Dreyfusards turned against him, labeling him an egocentric ingrate. They thought he should have rejected any type of amnesty and insisted on a full re-

examination of the case until he was proven innocent at a regular court-martial. Because of Dreyfus' acceptance of the pardon, the Dreyfusards were forced to find another cause to support. They began to use all their new-found power to destroy Catholicism because of its anti-Dreyfus stand and exploit anti-clericalism for electoral purposes.⁸⁵

Finally, in 1906, Dreyfus was declared innocent of all charges and reintegrated into the Army.⁸⁶ Still, the Affair lingered. Even when Dreyfus died in 1935, the general press was afraid to touch the issue while the Leftist newspapers spoke of Dreyfus' innocence, and the Right spoke of his guilt.⁸⁷

The Dreyfus Affair divided France irreparably. Not only were politics, society, and the Army degraded in the Affair, but the press as well. The French press became reckless, gullible, and base and was largely responsible for the hostility engendered on both sides. Its participation in the Affair was inflorious, although it was ultimately responsible for righting a miscarriage of justice. The Dreyfus Affair with its legacy of hate, turmoil, bitterness, and prejudice is a clear case of public opinion inflamed and nurtured by a vicious press.

FOOTNOTES

¹David L. Lewis, Prisoners of Honor: The Dreyfus Affair (New York, 1973), 27-29.

²Paris, La Libre Parole, November 1, 1894, in Louis L. Snyder, The Dreyfus Case: A Documentary History (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1973), 19.

³Robert F. Byrnes, Antisemitism in Modern France (New York, 1969), 110.

⁴Ibid., 130-136.

⁵Lewis, Prisoners, 20.

⁶Michael R. Marrus, The Politics of Assimilation: A Study of the French Jewish Community at the Time of the Dreyfus Affair (Oxford, 1971), 197.

⁷Ernst Nolte, Three Faces of Fascism (New York, 1966), 50.

⁸Lewis, Prisoners, 21.

⁹Ibid., 42-43.

¹⁰Ibid., 43.

¹¹Maurice Paleologue, An Intimate Journal of the Dreyfus Case (New York, 1957), 35.

¹²Snyder, Dreyfus Case, 30.

¹³Lewis, Prisoners, 49-50.

¹⁴Alfred Dreyfus and Pierre Dreyfus, The Dreyfus Case (New Haven, Connecticut, 1937), 23-26.

¹⁵Alexandre Zevaes, "The Hostility of the General Staff," Leslie Derfler, ed., The Dreyfus Affair: Tragedy of Errors? (Boston, 1936), 11.

¹⁶Nicholas Halasz, Captain Dreyfus: The Story of a Mass Hysteria (New York, 1955), 54.

¹⁷Lewis, Prisoners, 56.

¹⁸Paris, L'Autorite, January 6, 1895, in Snyder, Dreyfus Case, 36-38.

¹⁹Alfred Dreyfus, Five Years of My Life (London, 1901), 94, provides an excellent account of Dreyfus' imprisonment.

- ²⁰Lewis, Prisoners, 118.
- ²¹Ibid.
- ²²Ibid., 123.
- ²³Ibid.
- ²⁴Snyder, Dreyfus Case, 121-122.
- ²⁵Halasz, Captain Dreyfus, 98.
- ²⁶Lewis, Prisoners, 154-155.
- ²⁷Halasz, Captain Dreyfus, 98.
- ²⁸Lewis, Prisoners, 156.
- ²⁹Snyder, Dreyfus Case, 88-89.
- ³⁰Halasz, Captain Dreyfus, 67.
- ³¹Ibid.
- ³²Dreyfus and Dreyfus, The Dreyfus Case, 45.
- ³³Halasz, Captain Dreyfus, 70-71.
- ³⁴Ibid.
- ³⁵Lewis, Prisoners, 164-165.
- ³⁶Matthew Josephson, Zola and His Time (New York, 1928), 424-426.
- ³⁷Paris, Le Temps, November 14, 1897, in Snyder, Dreyfus Case, 142-143.
- ³⁸Paleologue, Intimate Journal Dreyfus Case, 78; The New York Times, December 12, 1897.
- ³⁹Snyder, Dreyfus Case, 161-176.
- ⁴⁰The New York Times, December 5, 1897.
- ⁴¹Snyder, Dreyfus Case, 176-187.
- ⁴²Lewis, Prisoners, 197.
- ⁴³Hannah Arendt, The Origins of Totalitarianism (New York, 1966), 110.
- ⁴⁴H. M. Hyndman, Clemenceau: The Man and His Time (New York, 1919), 173.

- ⁴⁵Halasz, Captain Dreyfus, 129-319.
- ⁴⁶The New York Times, January 19, 15, 18, 1898.
- ⁴⁷Josephson, Zola, 446.
- ⁴⁸Ibid.
- ⁴⁹Wilhelm Herzog, From Dreyfus to Petain: "The Struggle of a Republic" (New York, 1947), 211.
- ⁵⁰Lewis, Prisoners, 191.
- ⁵¹Halasz, Captain Dreyfus, 119.
- ⁵²Dreyfus and Dreyfus, The Dreyfus Case, 120.
- ⁵³Guy Chapman, The Dreyfus Trials (New York, 1972), 132-133.
- ⁵⁴Ibid., 139.
- ⁵⁵Lewis, Prisoners, 207.
- ⁵⁶Herzog, Dreyfus to Petain, 152.
- ⁵⁷Chapman, Dreyfus Trials, 147.
- ⁵⁸Halasz, Captain Dreyfus, 158-159. A good example of American journalism at this time is "The Dreyfus and Zola Trials," Atlantic Monthly, LXXXI (May 1898), 589-602.
- ⁵⁹Halasz, Captain Dreyfus, 136.
- ⁶⁰Ibid.
- ⁶¹Snyder, Dreyfus Case, 213-214.
- ⁶²D. W. Brogan, The Development of Modern France--1870-1939 (London, 1940), 341.
- ⁶³Snyder, Dreyfus Case, 223.
- ⁶⁴Ibid., 223-224.
- ⁶⁵Lewis, Prisoners, 242-243.
- ⁶⁶Snyder, Dreyfus Case, 225-226.
- ⁶⁷Elbert F. Baldwin, "A Day in Paris," The Outlook, 60 (Nov. 1898), 767; "Plotters Against France," The Outlook, 60 (Oct. 1898), 401.

- ⁶⁸Dreyfus and Dreyfus, The Dreyfus Case, 129.
- ⁶⁹Lewis, Prisoners, 247.
- ⁷⁰Ibid.
- ⁷¹Ibid., 255.
- ⁷²Ibid., 255-256
- ⁷³Ibid., 258.
- ⁷⁴Halasz, Captain Dreyfus, 189.
- ⁷⁵Snyder, Dreyfus Case, 254-256.
- ⁷⁶Lewis, Prisoners, 268-269.
- ⁷⁷Dreyfus, Five Years, 331-334.
- ⁷⁸Dreyfus and Dreyfus, The Dreyfus Case, 130.
- ⁷⁹G. W. Steevens, The Tragedy of Dreyfus (New York, 1899), 96.
- ⁸⁰Ibid.
- ⁸¹Snyder, Dreyfus Case, 335-336.
- ⁸²Ibid., 336.
- ⁸³R. D. Mandell, "The Affair and The Fair: Some Observations on the Closing Stages of the Dreyfus Case," Journal of Modern History, 39 (Sept. 1967), 255-256; 261-262.
- ⁸⁴Halasz, Captain Dreyfus, 239.
- ⁸⁵Lewis, Prisoners, 307.
- ⁸⁶Halasz, Captain Dreyfus, 263.
- ⁸⁷Arendt, Origins of Totalitarianism, 114.

HORSE BOOTS: A NINETEENTH CENTURY
KENTUCKY INDUSTRY

During the three decades following the Civil War, harness racing was a popular sport in Kentucky and throughout the nation. One of the developments that revolutionized the racing of trotters and pacers and was responsible for the rapid post-war growth of the sport was the use of a variety of horse boots--devices that protected the standardbreds from the characteristic self-inflicted wounds caused by their sharp hoofs. The inventor and manufacturer of this unique invention was a Kentuckian, Joseph Fennell of Cynthiana.

A native of New Jersey but life-long resident of Kentucky, Fennell joined the Confederate forces at the outbreak of the war and served throughout the conflict with a cavalry unit attached to the Army of Northern Virginia. As their supply of saddle horses dwindled during the war, cavalrymen in Fennell's unit who were forced to mount trotters discovered that their steeds were frequently lamed or incapacitated by self-inflicted leg wounds. A saddlemaker by trade, Fennell devised light weight leather "sleeves" that covered the horses' lower legs. Although these shields provided the desired protection, they hampered the animals' speed and therefore were of limited use.

Following the war's end, Fennell returned to Cynthiana and associated with veterans who liked to reminisce about their military adventures. At one such gathering Fennell mentioned the leather sleeves worn by the mounted trotters. His comment was overheard by another Harrison Countian Tom Scott,* who owned a fine standardbred stallion that also was plagued with self-inflicted wounds. Scott urged Fennell to make a similar device for his trotter. Fennell visited Scott's farm, made plaster casts of the animal's legs and, after weeks of experimentation, presented Scott with a unique leather boot with a flexible joint that protected the horse but did not hinder its speed. Scott raced his stallion in major competition across the midwest, and news of the horse boot spread. Fennell soon was deluged with

*Scott was the father of "Death Valley Scotty," one of the best known characters of the modern Southwest.

enough orders to necessitate hiring several assistants to help fill the requests.

In 1873 the Abdullah Race Track was built at Cynthiana, and as one of the state's finest trotting and training tracks, it attracted many racing enthusiasts for the semi-annual races. Visiting owners and trainers placed large orders for Fennell's boots and made numerous suggestions for new types of protective devices. By 1885 Fennell owned patent-rights for two dozen types of shin, knee, elbow, coronet, and quarter boots which he made in a variety of sizes. An extremely profitable industry had been developed without formal advertising.

Fennell annually purchased several freight-car loads of the finest domestic and imported leathers, felts, elastics and brass buckles, and he maintained a large staff of craftsmen, apprentices and laborers. The leather was moistened with water, shaped in molds, cut, stitched, lined with sheep's wool or felt and waxed and hand rubbed to a high gloss. The finished products were packed into heavy wooden boxes made at Fennell's lumberyard, loaded into Louisville & Nashville Railroad boxcars and shipped to individuals and dealers. Fennell's business ledgers indicate that orders were filled and sent to every state and territory of the continental United States as well as to numerous provinces of Canada and countries in South America and Europe. Trotters from the royal stables of Italy and Russia sported Fennell's boots.

The Panic of 1893 temporarily diminished interest in harness racing, and Fennell's "Cynthiana Horse Boot" Company was suddenly without customers. Hoping that the demand for his product would revive as the nation's economic situation improved, Fennell retained his best craftsmen until his fortune was depleted. Boots were made and stored in anticipation of the day when interest in harness racing would flourish again. Although he eventually sold most of the stored boots, the trotter did not regain its former popularity until after his death in 1919, and the advent of the automobile eliminated many customers who once bought boots for their fine carriage horses.

Upon Fennell's death in 1919, his Cynthiana home and the building that once housed his boot business were left to his unmarried daughters. The lead molds, order books, ledgers, invoices and other records that had not been destroyed earlier were packed into barrels and moved into the garden shed behind the family home and forgotten. Following the death of his youngest daughter in the spring of 1974, the family property was cleared of more than a century's collection of memorabilia, and the equipment and business records were found. Although the ledgers, which have been given to the Kentucky museum

at Western Kentucky University, are covered with grime and mildew and are well-eaten by the local wildlife, they remain legible and serve as a record of one of Kentucky's unique 19th century industries.

Information was obtained from:

Cynthiana Democrat, May 22, 1919, Aug. 29, 1974.

Patent Office Records, 1868-1885.

Fennell Family Bible, owned by Whitlock Fennell Disher of Cincinnati.

Tom Fennell to author, July 30, 1974.

Marshall Keys to author, Oct. 1, 1974.

Interview with Judge Richard Clary of Cynthiana, Aug. 13, 1974.

Interview with Miss Frank Smith of Cynthiana, Aug. 13, 1974.

Fennell Company Business Records, Baird Collection, Kentucky Library.

The only publication to date on trotters in Kentucky is "Among the Blue-Grass Trotters," Harper's New Monthly Magazine, 67 (Oct. 1883), 715-730. This article concentrates on the breeders of the trotters rather than other aspects. One of the volumes of the BiCentennial Bookshelf will be The Harness Horse in Kentucky, by Ken McCarr, but will not contain the above material--he will concentrate on the horses themselves rather than the related industries.

